

Balchunas, George Adam, 9259A.  
 Buskey, Paul Gordon, 9260A.  
 Schweiger, Walter John, Jr., 9261A.  
 Zink, Harry Johns, 9262A.  
 Perkins, Lytle Ray, 9263A.  
 Adams, George Marvin, 9264A.  
 Erben, James Betros, 9265A.  
 Spencer, Charles Flavius, 9266A.  
 Arcuri, Michael Joseph, 9267A.  
 Neal, John Robert, 9268A.  
 Williams, Ruth Lamar, 21279W.  
 Mirock, George Casimir, 9269A.  
 Godley, Lawrence Ely, 9270A.  
 Nichols, Willard Albert, 9271A.  
 Agan, Charles Kleth, 9272A.  
 Tarbet, Dale Fife, 9273A.  
 Past, Sheldon Joseph, 9274A.  
 Mecke, Harold Joseph, 9275A.  
 Bolt, Jones Edward, 9276A.  
 Cox, Richard Gordon, 9277A.  
 Robinson, Lillian Tombacher, 21281W.  
 Weniger, Robert Lee, Jr., 9278A.  
 Noel, William Honree, 9280A.  
 Clocksin, Albert Julius, 9281A.  
 Cole, Louis Biddle, 9282A.  
 Bruce, Robert Eugene, 9283A.  
 Johnston, Robert Rex, 9284A.  
 Callahan, Walter, 9285A.  
 Kane, Harold Edwin, 9286A.  
 Kerr, Kenneth James, 9287A.  
 Green, Norman Eldon, 9288A.  
 Peck, George Stanley, 9289A.  
 Spear, Sid Franklin, 9290A.  
 Shiner, Byron David, 9291A.  
 Iverson, Richard Junius, 9292A.  
 Andre, Louis Edward, Jr., 9293A.  
 Strong, Mary Helene, 21282W.  
 Anderson, William Landis, 9294A.  
 Nollkamper, James Louis, 9295A.  
 Pasero, Bernard Ben, 9296A.  
 Bergum, Lester Norman, 9297A.  
 Lowell, Marian Edwin, 9298A.  
 Cummings, Earl William, 9299A.  
 Hannah, George Lafayette, Jr., 9300A.  
 Bradley, Jack Tarelton, 9301A.  
 Thompson, Shirley Boyd, 9302A.  
 Emory, Frank Norman, 9304A.  
 Basel, George Phillip, 9305A.  
 Wood, Jim Henry, 9306A.  
 Winn, Chasteen Guy, Jr., 9307A.  
 Austin, Orlo Lorraine, 9308A.  
 Oglesby, Herbert Wills, 9309A.  
 Butler, Richard David, 9310A.  
 Byers, Vic L., Jr., 9311A.  
 Behrens, Liton August, 9312A.  
 English, Peter Franklin, 9313A.  
 Sweeney, James Earl, 9315A.  
 Hadley, James Alvin, 9316A.  
 Cronin, William Russ, 9317A.

## IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct date of rank from June 5, 1951, to June 1, 1951:

Donald E. Adams	Winston R. Hayes
Joe L. Akagi	Corky J. W. Hedges
Merle L. Anderson	John T. Higgins
Neil A. Armstrong	George B. Hogaboom
Cullen F. Bates, Jr.	Arthur D. Jessen
Gerald R. Bell	Wesley A. Johnson
Wallace A. Burgess	Albert J. Kacoroski
William F. Carlson	Arthur V. Kane
Ralph S. Colby	John M. Key
Eugene B. Conrad	George Kinsel
Valleau E. Curtis	Edward D. Kuball
Melvin H. Davidow	Robert P. LaMontagne
Jerry F. Detwiler	Armand R. Langlais
Gresham G. Downs	Stephen J. Ledogar
John R. Eckstein	Thomas D. Lewis
Walter A. Ellinghaus, Jr.	Freeman L. Lofton
David J. Ellison	Ralph A. McCroskey
Clarence Erkelens	Frank R. MacKinnis
Donald R. Frazor	John DaC. Meyer
Rodman W. Gaines, Jr.	Donald A. Miller
Donald A. Gardner	John M. Neel
Herbert A. Graham, Jr.	Charles P. Pressly III
John A. Gunderson	Herman C. Quitmeyer
William E. Hastings	Fred R. Robson

James M. Russ  
 Gilbert D. Saul  
 Kenneth A. Schechter  
 Thomas B. Smiley, Jr.  
 Lester R. Smith  
 David S. Stephenson  
 Stephen D. Stevning

The following named (naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct date of rank from June 5, 1951, to June 1, 1951:

Allen E. Alman	William G. McCormick
Jack H. Anderson	Theodore K. McCourry
Charles E. Axthelm	Bruce R. McCullough
Carlos P. Baker, Jr.	Edwin A. McLean
Arthur F. Barns	Richard O. McNerney
John B. Bierman	Charles D. Mendenhall
Robert T. Billington	Russell H. Miles, Jr.
Robert W. Blodgett	Forrest A. Miller
Elmer A. Bloomquist, Jr.	Albert C. Mitchell
Robert R. Boone	Lawrence G. Mische
Robert L. Boonstra	James W. Murray
Loren C. Borgwardt	Loren A. Norden
Daniel M. Branigan	William H. Payne
Donald H. Burger	Clifford L. Peacock
Donald E. Chelew	Thomas J. Peterson, Jr.
Charles L. Cotter	John H. Peterson
Frank S. Dennis	Robert L. Pfeiff
Roland S. Dick, Jr.	Richard E. Powell
Thomas J. Dixon	Richard K. Pulling
Gerald W. Fauth, Jr.	Tom M. Reese
Gilbert R. Fornatora	Arthur G. O. Roe
Kenneth Fox	Roger L. Rosback
Thomas C. Fuller	James A. Rose
Paul C. Gaertner, Jr.	Maurice T. Ross
Frank U. Garrard	William E. Ross
Robert J. Gibbons	Paul D. Saylor, Jr.
Elmer W. Gielow	Robert L. Sheppard, Jr.
Charles H. Golden	Claude R. Stamey, Jr.
Robert N. Gray	Rodney L. Stewart
Arthur S. Grenell	Harry M. Sumner
Jack T. Hamilton	James L. Thwing
William A. Henshaw	Mark E. Trivison
Lacy B. Herrmann	Russell W. VanDore,
Arthur F. Hooper	Jr.
Robert E. Hodgson, Jr.	Donnell Van Noppen,
Albert M. Hunt	Raymond D. Johnson Jr.
Joseph A. Juhlin, Jr.	Marvin P. Watkins
Robert C. Jung	Clarence L. Watson
Donald L. Keach	Donald E. Weant
Lawrence C. Lander III	Herbert H. Weidensaul
James C. Landkamer	Leonard T. Weinstein
Joseph C. Landwehr	Harold F. Wiley
Gordon A. Launders	Clinton C. Williams
Marks A. Levy	Richard N. Willse
Wayne P. Libhart	

John E. Clegg (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps to correct date of rank from June 5, 1951, to June 1, 1951:

James L. Black, Jr.	Edward K. Maxwell
Charles R. Browder	Ronald W. Olson
Robert P. Chaney	Roderick M. Stewart
Robert G. Christensen	Richard C. Stockton
Leonard W. Deden	William S. Torrance

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed, to correct date of rank from June 5, 1951, to June 1, 1951:

William C. Becker	Emerson M. Harris
John W. Carrigan	Christopher J. Kelly
Richard G. Gresla	Duane C. Nuechterlein
William S. Gripman	Floyd O. Stroup

The following-named women officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Virginia A. Brey	Louise Budrey
Dora Brownstein	Stephanie Bulik

Leocadia A. Chlebow-June Pikutis  
 ska Margaret E. Redd  
 Evelyn P. Mitchell Ruth E. Robertson

## LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Ruth H. Styron

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

## To be commissioned captain

Thomas B. Reed, effective July 1, 1951.

## To be commissioned lieutenant (junior grade)

Dewey G. Rushford, effective October 8, 1951.

## To be commissioned ensigns

Earl E. Ellis, effective December 11, 1951.

Marion M. Cottrell, effective December 11, 1951.

Donald L. Campbell, effective December 15, 1951.

Albert J. Ramey, effective December 18, 1951.

Robert M. Borst, effective December 25, 1951.

Joshua N. Chopy, effective December 25, 1951.

John F. Vance, Jr., effective December 25, 1951.

Robert T. Koopman, effective December 28, 1951.

Robert C. Munson, effective January 9, 1952.

Howland S. Foote, effective January 9, 1952.

Vartges Engustian, effective January 9, 1952.

Lawrence R. Whitney, effective January 10, 1952.

Gerard E. Haraden, effective January 10, 1952.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1951

(Legislative day of Tuesday, September 4, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O thou God of grace and glory, by thronging duties pressed we pause reverently and with quiet hearts for a dedicated moment at this daily altar of prayer. We are grateful that amid all life's vicissitudes and buffetings, its strain and stress, that—

"From every stormy wind that blows,  
 From every swelling tide of woes,  
 There is a calm, a sure retreat;  
 'Tis found beneath the mercy seat."

And so, facing tests of wisdom that are beyond our puny, fallible powers, we seek a strength that is not our own. We fain would join the exultant company who across all the centuries have been able to chant with victorious gladness: "I sought the Lord, and He heard me and delivered me from all my fears."

Grant us a common faith that any tyranny over the bodies and minds of men carries with it its own death germs.

Singing in our hearts, "A mighty fortress is our God, a bulwark never failing," let us march confidently toward the clean world our hands can help to fashion. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 11, 1951, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

#### RESIGNATION OF GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL AS SECRETARY OF DEFENSE— NOMINATIONS OF ROBERT A. LOVETT AND WILLIAM C. FOSTER

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am informed that the Secretary of Defense, George C. Marshall, has tendered his resignation. The message which has just come to the Senate from the President contains the information that Robert A. Lovett, of New York, has been appointed to be Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, few men in our history can match General Marshall's record of devoted service to America as a soldier and statesman. He will go down in the annals of America as a great patriot and a great general, one who played a major part in helping lead this country to victory in World War II. He has always been a dedicated American, a man willing to serve his country in peace and in war through arduous years, a man willing to sacrifice his own health to do so. He has earned a rest, and he has earned the enduring admiration and heartfelt gratitude of his countrymen. I commend him for the splendid service he has rendered, and I wish him well. I hope he will have many, many years of happy life before him.

Mr. President, I am confident that Mr. Lovett will be an able Secretary of Defense. The President is to be commended for sending Mr. Lovett's nomination to the Senate for confirmation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, we have all learned with deepest regret of the resignation of Secretary Marshall. He is a great soldier, a great statesman, but above all that he is a man of great nobility of character. I look on General Marshall as one of the greatest men this country has produced in my time. His resignation is a tremendous loss to the country. He is entitled, of course, to rest after his arduous duties covering so many years, but the country will greatly miss him as a wise and courageous leader. The country will wish him well in any activity in which he may engage in the future and pray that he will have many more years of good health, contentment, and further service.

Mr. President, I am heartened by the fact that the President has nominated Mr. Robert A. Lovett to succeed General Marshall. I have known Mr. Lovett, who

is a New Yorker, for a great many years. He served as Assistant Secretary of War for Air. Later he served again under General Marshall as Under Secretary of State during the very difficult years of Secretary Marshall's tenure of office. During the past year he has served as Deputy Secretary to General Marshall, Secretary of Defense. In all these activities he has shown great ability, and has served with unusual fidelity and distinction. He is a man of intense patriotism, intelligent, loyal, tactful, and yet possessed of unusual firmness. I know he has always had the complete loyalty of the men and women who served under him. To me it is of great comfort that he will succeed Secretary Marshall in this very difficult assignment. The President could not have made a better choice.

I am also very glad, indeed, to note that the President has sent to the Senate the nomination of Mr. William C. Foster, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense. Like Mr. Lovett, Mr. Foster is an old and valued and highly honored friend. He has been in Government service for some time. After the resignation of the Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, Mr. Paul Hoffman, Mr. Foster was recalled from his very important duties as head of the ECA in Europe, which he had discharged with great distinction, and placed at the head of that great organization which has done such outstanding and such valuable work for our country and for our allies abroad.

I want to say again that while nothing can mitigate my regret over the resignation of General Marshall, it is a source of rejoicing to me, as I think it should be to all the people of the country, that he will be succeeded by such an outstanding man as Robert Lovett, and that Robert Lovett will have the assistance, as deputy, of Mr. Foster.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the comments which have just been made by the Senator from New York. I talked with General Marshall this morning, and I said to him what I will now say upon the floor of the Senate. I have been in intimate contact with him in the discharge of his duties as they brought him before the Appropriations Committee in the various capacities which he has filled as Chief of Staff, as Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as Secretary of State, and as Secretary of Defense. In all my experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee I have never known a man who had a greater knowledge, or a more precise and intelligent grasp of the facts and figures which he was presenting to the committee, than did General Marshall through all the years. His patience, his tolerance, his ability, his understanding, and, above all, his wisdom, were made clear day after day in his presentations. I feel that his resignation brings a great loss to our country. He has put us all in his debt by the manner in which he has carried out the functions of the great responsibilities which

from time to time have been placed upon him.

His life has been the life of a soldier, but his mind and his philosophy have always been the mind and philosophy of a civilian. He is a man who has never forgotten that this is a Nation of individuals, that this is a Nation created under the Constitution of the United States, in which the people are the source of all authority which may be exercised over them, either economic or political. I feel that I would be remiss if I did not today express my great admiration and respect for the retiring Secretary of Defense.

Like the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I have also a very great admiration for Deputy Secretary Lovett. In the preparation of the bill which is the pending business before the Senate, day after day I have been in contact with Deputy Secretary Lovett. He is a man of understanding and ability, a man of high character, a man of great devotion to the public service. I think the Nation is very fortunate indeed to have a man of such high quality to step into the shoes of the great American who is retiring as Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not want to be farming out the time. I presume that a number of Senators would like to speak in regard to Secretary Marshall. I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be recognized for that purpose, and that thereafter Senators may be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I desire to join my colleague from New York and the senior Senator from Wyoming in the sentiment which they have already expressed regarding the retirement of General Marshall and the nominations of Mr. Lovett and Mr. Foster to the respective positions which are to be assigned to them.

With regard to General Marshall, I happen to be among those who voted for the confirmation of his nomination as Secretary of Defense. I have admired him for his achievement, even as I have criticized him for his shortcomings. He has had a long and distinguished career. As I pointed out in my remarks last year when his nomination was confirmed, he deserved the recognition being given him at that time. More than anyone else who was mentioned at the moment, he was qualified for the position to which he was appointed, namely, that of Secretary of Defense. At the same time, he was deserving of retirement. Only last June, I am told, there came a day which marked the fiftieth anniversary of his active service for his country. That is an unusual thing to happen to any person. No man, after a career such as General Marshall has had, can more deserve high tribute than does he. No man can merit retirement and peace of mind, which I trust will be his from now on, more than does General Marshall. He is a great American. He has demonstrated it time and time again.



As for my colleagues from New York—and I am referring to our two colleagues in the service of our Government whose nominations have just been submitted by the President—I think the President has chosen wisely and well. I trust that my colleague from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] will not object when their nominations finally come before the Senate for confirmation, because I have noted that North Dakota is now receiving considerable recognition from the standpoint of appointments by the President.

I assure my colleague from North Dakota that, had the President attempted to do better in New York than he has done in these two selections, he could not have improved upon them. These men are eminently qualified for the positions assigned to them. I believe that this estimate of qualifications applies equally to Mr. Lovett, who has been Deputy Secretary of Defense during this trying period of time, and to Mr. William C. Foster, whose experience and record in the ECA have been outstanding.

So, Mr. President, trusting that there will be no objection to the confirmation of the nominations of these two distinguished New Yorkers, and assuring my beloved colleague from North Dakota that none of us from New York had anything to do with the nominations from the standpoint of seeking recognition for New York, but assuring him also that we take pride in the fact that these two distinguished gentlemen are New Yorkers, I ask him kindly to allow these nominations be speedily confirmed, as he has allowed some others from New York to be confirmed. At the same time, Mr. President, I predict that both of these gentlemen will perform with distinction the vitally important duties which are to be assigned to them and that they will continue to be a credit not only to the Empire State, but to the country which they are serving.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to add some of my thoughts to what has been said by distinguished Senators about General Marshall. I had the honor and privilege of knowing him when he was a colonel in my home city of Charleston at a small fort. I have followed his career with interest. Certainly everything that has been said about him is more than deserved. General Marshall has earned a far greater place in our history than that of an outstanding military man. From a richly deserved retirement he heeded the call of his country to return to a most difficult task. His service to his country, both in and out of uniform, has been a guiding light to our military and civilian population. It is my sincere wish that General Marshall may now spend many leisure years, secure among the memories of a full measure of devotion and service to the Nation he loves. The tributes and good wishes of our people will bear witness to the esteem in which he is held. His resignation is a great loss at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice in tribute to the great record which General Marshall has made in a long public career. I consider General Marshall one of the greatest

military leaders in all our history; but I am satisfied that American history will record also that he was one of the greatest statesmen in our history. In fact, I believe that one of the richest compensations I have received in my brief period of public service has been the close contact I have had, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, with the great Marshall.

I know of no man with whom I have worked who has been such a source of inspiration to me; a man who in every act has demonstrated the courage of placing principle above any form of personal advantage or partisanship. It is a great loss to the American people to lose the services of the great Marshall. I agree with my distinguished colleague from New York that he certainly has earned the retirement which is now his.

In closing I want to add my voice to those who deplore any question being raised as to the great loyalty of Marshall to the basic concepts of our American system of government and to his undying opposition to the Communist philosophy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very happy to add a word of tribute to General Marshall. I am one of those who occasionally have differed with the general on matters of policy, and I should so state; but I have had a personal relationship with General Marshall which has been such that it has left a lasting impression on me of a great character and a great friend. I have known General Marshall in various connections ever since I have been in the United States Senate, and I believe that he has richly deserved retirement after years of faithful and devoted public service. I want to pay this tribute to him personally and to express my warm regard for the General and Mrs. Marshall, both of whom are personal friends of Mrs. Smith and myself.

I should like also to say a word about the nomination of Mr. Lovett and Mr. Foster. Both these gentlemen have been friends of mine since the beginning of their service for the Federal Government. I have known of them in other connections, through business, and so forth, in New York. I have come to know them both well as they have very capably carried out their public responsibilities. I want to take this occasion to commend the nomination of Mr. Lovett to be Secretary of Defense, and to express my eagerness to cooperate with him in every way possible in the performance of the very arduous duties which he is now undertaking.

I also wish to express my gratification at the nomination of Mr. Foster, and I am most hopeful that it will help bring about the coordination of our military and economic program in the measure recently passed by the Senate and shortly to be discussed in conference.

My tribute to these eminent men is based also, as in the case of General Marshall, on personal relationships, and I desire to extend to them and to the administration my congratulations on these admirable nominations for appointment to public service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the departure of Gen. George Marshall from his post as this Nation's Secretary of Defense will be viewed by his countrymen as a distinct loss.

George Marshall is one of the great Americans of our times. Long after the trivial carping of his detractors has been forgotten, the memory of George Marshall's service will still stand as an inspiring monument to future defenders of freedom in the world.

No other man of his times understood so well the threats of twentieth century totalitarianism. On the field of battle and in the area of diplomacy, George Marshall understood the threats, made his countrymen understand the threats also, and because of his efforts freedom has survived and will continue to survive.

George Marshall was a remarkable combination of soldier and statesman. When he was most needed, he answered the call to duty, and within the past year he has contributed immeasurably to setting this Nation upon the course of strength to withstand the onslaughts of armed Communist aggression.

We who knew him and worked with him will be sorry he is leaving, but we do not begrudge him the rest he richly deserves.

The choice of the man who has been chosen as George Marshall's successor is a happy choice.

Robert Lovett has not only the capacity and the experience to fill this gigantic job of directing the Nation's defense, he has, also, that essential ingredient of unrelenting courage which inspires confidence and action in hours of grave peril.

Robert Lovett, like George Marshall, understands our enemy well, both from the military viewpoint and from the diplomatic viewpoint. With him in command, the Nation's defenses are in good hands.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a great Christian, a great military leader, and a great American. I have never come in contact with George Marshall that I have not felt the effect of having been with a great Christian gentleman. Every time he opened his mouth to speak he gave me the impression that I was listening to someone who was close to God.

As a military leader he is second to none. I fear that there are some few people in America who have failed to give him his due credit for this leadership during World War II. We should be mindful of the fact that, as Chief of Staff, he issued general orders that were carried out on the field of battle. Some people give the generals on the field of battle all the credit. I do not do so.

I fail to see how any person in his right mind could raise any question doubting George Marshall's qualities as one of our great Americans. If any person is true to our American way of life it is George Marshall. I grieve at losing the services of a man who is so great in so many ways.

Mr. Lovett, who will step into the shoes of George Marshall, has a hard task to perform, but I believe he will

come nearer to doing it than anyone else I know of at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair apologizes in a sense for speaking from the rostrum, but he is sure that the Senate will not object in this case.

I have known General Marshall and have been associated with him for so long and so intimately that I would not want any opportunity to pass by without placing myself alongside of those who have spoken and the thousands, and perhaps even millions, of others in private capacity who will speak with regard to the general's retirement.

It was only by accident that he was born in Pennsylvania, instead of in Kentucky. He and I have joked about that many times. The Marshalls are an old family of Virginia, and he has been a credit to that family.

He has combined military genius with statecraft to a degree rarely found in any one man. Not only has he been a great soldier, not only has he understood the logistics of war and campaigns and the deployment of men, but he has understood human nature, and he has been one military man with whom I have come in contact who has understood the political implications, not from a partisan sense, but from the sense of the effect upon government, of any military campaign or any decisions made in connection with a military campaign. Not only has he been a military statesman, as I have often said, but he has been a statesman-like soldier, whichever way one may prefer to use the two terms combined.

In addition to all these qualities, he has been a good man, a sincere man, a man of courage and of generosity. In all the conferences in which I participated and which he attended—Cabinet meetings, meetings of the Security Council, and informal conferences both during the war and since the war—I do not believe I ever heard General Marshall speak ill in a personal sense of any man.

So I share the deep sorrow which all of us feel in his retirement, although recognizing that he is entitled to it. When he became Secretary of State, he did so purely as a matter of service to his country. He had then earned retirement by reason of his long military career. He served with distinction as Secretary of State.

When President Truman called him back to service as Secretary of Defense, General Marshall served in that capacity purely as a matter of service to his country, for there was nothing he could gain either personally or politically or financially from serving either as Secretary of State or as Secretary of Defense.

Therefore, all of us recognize General Marshall's right to retire. We regret profoundly that he is retiring, and we wish for him many years of health and happiness, and usefulness in any undertaking in which he may care to engage.

I am happy that the President has appointed Bob Lovett as General Marshall's successor. I have had very intimate association with Mr. Lovett. There is no man for whose intellectual integrity I have greater respect. I knew, al-

though only superficially, his distinguished father, who was a lawyer and a railroad executive; and I have come to know Bob Lovett as one of the outstanding men in this country from the standpoint of pure, sheer ability, patriotism, and understanding of our institutions.

I also wish to say that I believe the President has made a wise choice in selecting Mr. Foster as Mr. Lovett's successor. It seems to me that these two appointments are to be commended by everyone who is interested in the high caliber and high quality of our public servants.

In order that the record may be complete, I take the liberty, with the consent of the Senate, of asking that there be printed in the Record the announcement from the White House, dated September 11, of the resignation of General Marshall, and of the nominations of Mr. Robert A. Lovett and Mr. William C. Foster, and of Mr. Richard M. Bissell, Jr., to be Acting Administrator of ECA; and that there also be printed the letter of the President accepting General Marshall's resignation, and the text of General Marshall's letter to the President tendering his resignation.

The release and letters are as follows:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1951.

The President has accepted, with great reluctance, the resignation of Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, to be effective at the close of business today.

At the time of his appointment as Secretary of Defense in September of last year, it was agreed that General Marshall would serve until June 30, 1951. However on that date, because so much legislation of great importance to the armed services was still largely in a state of hearings before committees of Congress, General Marshall agreed to carry on until the end of the summer. Specifically, he agreed to remain until a report had been made by the Commission created to recommend to the Congress the basic policies to govern the universal military training. That report now has been completed.

The President is today forwarding to the Senate the nomination of Robert A. Lovett, Deputy Secretary of Defense, to be Secretary of Defense.

William C. Foster, Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, will be nominated at the same time as Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Richard M. Bissell, Jr., Deputy Administrator, will become Acting Administrator of ECA.

The President has sent the following letter to the Honorable George C. Marshall accepting his resignation as Secretary of Defense:

SEPTEMBER 11, 1951.

DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: It is with very great reluctance that I accept your resignation as Secretary of Defense effective, in accordance with your wishes, on September 12.

I have stated many times, both publicly and privately, my high regard for your many services to the country throughout your long and distinguished career as a Government servant. At this time I wish particularly to mention the tremendous strides that have been made, under your direct leadership, in establishing a sound basis for our military manpower and production program which already has tremendously increased our defensive strength.

I understand fully and am sympathetic with the reasons for your resignation at this time, and I am most appreciative of your willingness to remain 2 months beyond our

agreement in order to complete your activities concerning the Universal Military Training Act.

In again accepting your resignation from a position of high responsibility, I realize how many times previously you have sought to retire to private life. But one time after another you have responded to the call to public service.

To all of these offices you have brought great talent and wisdom. In fact, no man ever has given his country more distinguished and patriotic service than have you.

On behalf of our country, I want to thank you for all you have done. On my own behalf, I want to tell you of my deep personal appreciation for the wise counsel and the unwavering support you have given me in these trying days.

You have earned your retirement manyfold, and I wish you many good years at Leesburg.

With every good wish.

Gratefully and sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Following is the text of General Marshall's letter to the President:

SEPTEMBER 1, 1951.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: With deep regret I feel I must terminate my active daily service in the Government, and therefore submit my resignation as Secretary of Defense to be effective within the next 2 weeks.

Our original understanding prior to my appointment was that I would serve only until June 30, 1951. That time has now been extended more than 2 months.

As I explained to you personally, I do this with deep regret, but as you well know I will always be available for whatever temporary service you may desire of me.

Meanwhile I assure you of my loyal devotion to you and the National Government.

With great regret and respect.

Faithfully yours,

GEORGE C. MARSHALL.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, General Marshall has rendered distinguished services to his country both in war and in the later struggle for peace.

It has been most fortunate for the United States that in all emergencies there have arisen men of outstanding ability, of unswerving integrity, of soundest judgment, who have been competent to exert leadership toward the successful defense of our people and the sound administration of their affairs.

General Marshall is in this category. He was an outstanding soldier, a distinguished statesman, and a brilliant administrator.

For 50 years he has served his country at home and abroad with honor and distinction. He has given vigorous leadership to national defense and to the cause of peace.

His foresight and acumen paved the way for success in World War II, and his devotion to duty, his willingness to respond at any cost to the call of his country have made him a truly national figure whose reputation for honor and integrity is world-wide.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order entered on request of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFarland], routine business is now in order.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to



the advertising agency apparently was that there were many people, like the Senator from Vermont, who listen to this program, and that perhaps they would be interested.

Mr. AIKEN. I listen to it. That is why I know about it. The question arises in my mind, however, as to the necessity of putting on elaborate radio and television programs to stimulate recruiting when the draft law is in effect. But I see that the Army puts the blame on Congress again, because it is said that this program was put on because Congress appropriated the money for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let us make the matter clear now, before the Senator goes further. He says that it seems rather useless that such a program should be carried out while the draft law is in effect. Let me read from the draft law. I read from section 20, under the heading "Effective date":

The Secretary of the Army for the Army and the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy for the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard, are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensive voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strengths.

So the Congress of the United States instructed the Department of Defense to carry on such a campaign when that law was passed.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not hear the slightest reference to The Shadow or even to radio programs in the section of the law from which the Senator read.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The details of the program were not outlined. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that by the rules of the Senate the Appropriations Committee is forbidden to write legislative riders into appropriation bills. If it is desired to curtail the expense of carrying on a voluntary-enlistment program so that fewer men will have to be drafted, the place to carry that story is before the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The Army says, in effect, that if the Congress had not appropriated the money it would not have put this mystery-serial program over the air on Sunday afternoons. It seems to me that the Army has given us a cue to the remedy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, even though the distinguished Senator from Vermont enjoyed the program called The Shadow, does he think that the taxpayers of the United States should be expected to put up the funds so that The Shadow can be put on for the Senator's enjoyment?

Mr. AIKEN. The pleasure which the Senator from Vermont got from listening to The Shadow was considerably alloyed at the end when he found that he was helping to pay for it through taxation. I think there are probably

private interests who would be willing to continue this program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Along the line of the statement of the Senator from Wyoming, it is my understanding from the armed services and from the conferences on the unification bill and the Selective Service bill, that the best soldiers are volunteers. A volunteer who enters the service on his own volition contemplates a longer term of enlistment, with the hope that he may remain and make the Army or Navy a career. A drafted soldier is in for a shorter period of time, and it is reasonably clear that he will leave the service once his term is over.

Therefore, it is more efficient, more economical, and better judgment to secure the service of a man who joins the Armed Forces because he wants to do so, and will serve for a longer period of time.

With respect to the money which is spent for advertising, I have never listened to this particular program, and I very seldom listen to any such programs.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator should listen sometime. It is a very good mystery program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I conclude by saying that over a long period of time any money which is spent for publicity for procurement of volunteers, if well spent by competent people, is of value to the taxpayers. I do not say that the program to which the Senator from Vermont has referred was that kind of program.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that we should have as many volunteers as possible. However, there is not a college in this country where the boys do not know that they can volunteer for the Army if they want to do so. There are recruiting offices in every town of any size. It is absolutely unnecessary to put on multi-million-dollar programs—and that is what the total cost must amount to for all the armed services—in order to induce enlistments. I hope the programs are not put on for the purpose of keeping in right with the advertising medium they employ.

I am wondering about another factor. The contract for advertising was placed with an advertising concern in Chicago. There would be perhaps as much as \$22,500 which would go outright to one advertising concern as a fee. It seems to me that here is one place where we could save some money by stopping the elaborate multi-million-dollar advertising, publicity, and propaganda campaigns of our Government agencies.

I understand that the Department of the Treasury is sponsoring the Sammy Kaye orchestra. That must cost even more than The Shadow and other programs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Vermont aware of the fact that the pres-

ent budget contains an item of \$3,000,000 for advertising on the part of the Department of Defense?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has stated that it would be beyond the power of the Committee on Appropriations to put a rider on the bill. That is correct. But certainly the Appropriations Committee is under no obligation to provide funds just because there is an authorization for a certain purpose. The Appropriations Committee repeatedly denies funds for projects for which authorizations have been made.

As an example of the way the so-called directive is being followed, I should like to read to the Senate a letter which was written by a sergeant of the recruiting service of the Army and Air Force on the 16th of July 1951. It is addressed to a young man who has received his preinduction notice. It should be borne in mind that this letter is from the recruiting service:

DEAR SIR: The Selective Service Board of—

The name of the town—

states that your preinduction draft notice will be in the mail within the next three (3) days.

Did you know that you can still volunteer—

That sentence, "Did you know that you can still volunteer," is capitalized and underscored—

for the Air Force or the Army before—

The word "before" is underscored—

you receive your preinduction notice? After receipt of your preinduction draft notice, you will be ineligible to volunteer for any branch of service.

Would it be possible for you to come into this office within a few hours after receiving this letter? We believe we have something that will be of vital interest to you.

Sincerely yours.

It is signed by the recruiting sergeant.

The point I wish to make is that we spend money to maintain the recruiting service and it is writing letters to boys after they get their preinduction notices, informing them that if they come to the recruiting officer he can offer them something of interest.

The suggestion that ought to be made in the interest of economy is that the entire job of recruiting personnel for the armed services should be left to the local draft boards. If it were, credits for volunteers could be adjusted each month. It is a known fact that there is a lag between the time an enlistment takes place and when the draft board gets credit for the enlistment.

After a draft board has sent out its preinduction notices, if the recruiting service comes along and succeeds in herding boys into the service by this kind of solicitation, the draft board must go through its work again and send out other notices in order to meet its quota. Furthermore, the board does not get credit for its volunteers until several months thereafter. If the recruiting were handled by the local draft boards, they could accept volunteers, and thus

to pay high prices is an undesirable practice and a growing one: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the appropriate Federal agencies shall exercise such authority as is given to them by law to prevent repetition of this practice of limiting telecasting of events of national interest to those members of the public who can afford to pay therefor and who are able to be present at the selected places where such telecasts are available; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Department of Justice, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and other appropriate agencies are requested to advise the Senate of the United States as to what additional legislation may be necessary to prevent the repetition of such practice and, in particular, to assure that the telecasting of events of national interest shall be available to all patients confined to military and veterans hospitals.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, millions of sports-loving people in America will be deprived of watching the telecast of the world's championship boxing match which is to take place tonight at the Polo Grounds in New York City.

Many hundreds of wounded, sick, and hospitalized veterans of our armed services will likewise be deprived of viewing this athletic event of national prominence.

Mr. President, this should not be so. The resolution is intended to set in motion the machinery of our Federal agencies to the end that a check be placed upon the attempt of those who would monopolize the transmission and showing by television of events of national importance.

Tonight it is boxing—tomorrow it may encompass the entire field of sport, entertainment, and all other events of national and international import.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of the enormous economic, social, and legal problem this situation presents, but I feel strongly that the Members of the Senate cannot afford to have the tentacles of monopoly reach out and deprive our people of the privileges which should rightfully be theirs.

I quote from a communication I have received from Mr. Abe J. Greene, president of the National Boxing Association, and State Athletic Commissioner of the State of New Jersey, concerning the problem as it affects our hospitalized veterans:

As the scope of this form of television broadens, the free public telecasting will become conversely circumscribed. Thus, the veterans in hospitals will be similarly affected and deprived of just the type of entertainment they most relish. Certainly, I think that the Government owes it to these boys who are confined to provide every medium of entertainment and these installations need not be costly while their advantages and benefits will be unlimited.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 355) to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY:

Address delivered by Senator BUTLER of Maryland at the Port of Baltimore Day luncheon, Baltimore, Md., September 12, 1951, sponsored by the Propeller Club, port of Baltimore.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

Address delivered by Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, at dedication of new General Accounting Office Building in Washington, D. C., on September 11, 1951.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Letter dated September 6, 1951, addressed by Senator BUTLER of Nebraska to Manly Fleischmann, Administrator of the National Production Authority, regarding the effect of the restrictions on steel on the school-construction program.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Statement by T. W. Thornhill, of Charleston, S. C., regarding the visit of the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect soil-conservation districts in North Carolina and South Carolina.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Letter dated August 29, 1951, addressed to the President by Maurice Tishman, a member of the American Legion, dealing with the duty of Americans to oppose communism.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Editorial entitled "Why Drag Schools Into Argument on Tidelands Issue," published in the August 25, 1951, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

By Mr. LANGER:

Article entitled "State Mill Shows Good Net Profit," published in the Kildeer (N. Dak.) Herald of August 23, 1951, showing the profit earned by the North Dakota Mill & Elevator at Grand Forks, N. Dak.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Article entitled "Iran's Best Neighbor—Utah," written by Ferdinand Kuhn, and published in the Washington Post of September 12, 1951.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Article entitled "Tass, Classified," written by James Daniel, and published in the Washington Daily News of September 8, 1951, regarding the imprisonment in Czechoslovakia of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis and the status of Tass as a department of the Soviet Government.

#### NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AFFORD RELIEF TO AREAS STRICKEN BY RECENT FLOOD DISASTER

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized for 10 minutes, in order to make a statement at this time on a most important matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the flood destruction and damage sustained by the States of

Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. In that connection, many of us are wondering what will happen to the proposed legislation which has been presented for consideration on both sides of the Capitol dome.

It was on July 12 of this year, and even before that date, that the floods hit Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma. I shall not undertake to recount how great was this national disaster; suffice it to say that it is estimated that damage exceeding \$1,000,000,000 resulted therefrom. Thousands of homes and businesses were wiped out or were completely ruined. Thousands of persons within that area now have no visible means of livelihood and are struggling to get started again against tremendous odds.

The President, as well as numerous Members of Congress, surveyed the damage. Many of them visited the scene and made a personal examination of the devastated areas.

We recall that it was on July 17 that an emergency-relief measure appropriating \$25,000,000 was passed by the Congress.

When the Members of Congress returned from the scene, they were impressed with the fact that further help was badly needed, and that some action should be taken promptly. It is to their credit that various governmental agencies, the Red Cross, and many other institutions, all of which were interested in that situation, cooperated marvelously. The RFC and the Housing and Home Agency also cooperated and sent representatives to the scene of the disaster, to ascertain what they could do and they have acted and are doing everything they can to meet the emergency needs.

I desire to remind the Senate that on August 1 of this year Representative BOLLING, of Missouri, introduced House bill 5022, which was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. That measure provides for payment for property losses resulting from the floods.

On August 1, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] introduced in this body Senate bill 1935, a companion bill which was referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

On August 20, the President of the United States, after he had visited the flooded area, sent to the Congress a message in which he requested of Congress an appropriation of \$400,000,000 to indemnify the flood victims for some of their losses, to guarantee on rather liberal terms loans designed to help farmers drain and rehabilitate their lands, to assist cities and smaller communities, and to provide insurance for those in the flood areas against future flood damage which might occur. On August 20 Representative BOLLING introduced in the House H. R. 5259, providing appropriations for the rehabilitation of midwestern flood-stricken areas and for other purposes.

Mr. President, I am wondering when the Congress will take action on those measures. We rush through important measures in this body, and that also happens on the other side of the Capitol



Dome. All those measures are important, of course. The other day we passed a bill authorizing the appropriation of \$7,500,000,000 for Europe. We are now considering a most important bill, appropriating \$61,000,000,000 to protect the national security and to provide for defense.

Important as are those bills, I am firmly convinced that our domestic difficulties are equally important. In my judgment, the authorization of the appropriation of \$7,500,000,000 was no more important than is the rehabilitation of those who live within a great area who so recently suffered a disaster of catastrophic proportions caused by the floods.

Press reports indicate that representatives of foreign nations are presently in our Capital. Recently they have been here seeking relief for some of their difficulties. Do I think they are entitled to any more consideration than the folks at home? Candidly, I do not. I could recount the aid we have given to other foreign peoples and projects, and quickly. The present session of the Congress is expected to come to a close, as some think, around October 1. I wonder whether it is the intention of those in charge of the agenda of the schedules providing the times at which various measures shall be taken up for consideration to allow the bill providing aid for the flood sufferers—important as I think this bill is—to remain in committee unacted upon. It is important to the people of the affected areas. It was sufficiently important that the President of the United States made a tour of inspection of the devastated area, following which he sent a message to the Congress. I am sure that he, with all the rest of us, expected expeditious handling of the matter, and that it is the intention of those who have the responsibility of channeling this proposed legislation, to take some positive action as rapidly as possible, and before this session closes. I think it no more than fair to ask, When will it be done?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I will yield in a moment. The Senator from Kansas is very much interested in this subject and the entire Kansas delegation also is interested. We have had several meetings regarding it. We desire to cooperate, as I know the Members of the Congress from Oklahoma and Missouri do.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. CARLSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Being a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I may say to my distinguished friend from Kansas that that committee always acts promptly on all bills. If the Senator will be present at the convening of our session at 10:30 o'clock on Monday, he can be assured that the committee will take action upon the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I am delighted to know that. I now yield to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the senior Senator from Kansas for his timely statement in regard to the need for early and immediate action on legislation which has been proposed for the relief of those who suffered so disastrously in the recently flooded areas. I assure him and I assure the Senate that I shall be pleased to appear before the committee to present the problem confronting the people in the devastated area, through accurate testimony and figures which have been submitted to us as to the need for the proposed legislation being passed by the Senate, and that we shall be glad to assist in any way we can to get action on the proposed legislation.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I am delighted, of course, to have the statement which was made by the Senator from North Dakota, who is a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee and from my colleague Senator CARLSON. I mean no criticism of the committee. I know they are busily engaged in their activities. But I do desire to stress the importance of prompt action because of the drastic character of the situation and the need for rehabilitation of the people who are so seriously affected.

#### THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I was under the impression that we were still in the morning hour, and I rose for the purpose of making an insertion in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday and the day before, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and I both called attention to the fact that the Japanese peace negotiations in San Francisco were carried on in the best bipartisan traditions. I am one of those who feel concerned over the possibility of partisanship entering into the further consideration of the Japanese situation and the far-eastern situation generally, in connection with the treaties which will presently be before the Senate for ratification. But, Mr. President, I feel that bipartisanship is a two-way street. I regret exceedingly that the President of the United States, in referring to the accomplishment in San Francisco, failed to give to Mr. Dulles the credit to which I think he is entitled for his wonderful generalship of the treaty negotiations over a period of 12 months. Mr. Arthur Krock has called attention to this omission in an article entitled "Before the Gavel There Was the Spade," published in yesterday's New York Times, in which he points out that "had it not been for the spade of John Foster Dulles the gavel of Mr. Acheson could not have been wielded as it was at San Francisco."

In making these remarks, I am in no way reflecting on Mr. Acheson, who handled that proceeding in such a masterly way. I paid tribute to him yesterday. But we simply have to have an atmosphere of bipartisanship in dealing with this matter, and it was a great shock to the Republicans who attended the conference in San Francisco when, on the very day on which we were planning to open the conference, the President of the United States appeared in San Francisco at a public gathering which was entirely Democratic, and to which none of the Republicans had been invited. It was a wonderful opportunity to have brought together the delegates to the conference and to have them all sitting together, with the President of the United States addressing us in an informal way before the convention opened. But, unfortunately as it seemed to me, the President took the occasion as he said himself, to be a Democrat, during the luncheon and until 2 o'clock in the afternoon, and he then became an American in the evening, for the opening of the conference.

I mention that because I am one of those who favor doing all we can to keep partisanship out of the far-eastern situation. I urgently request that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle join us in this endeavor, and urge the President to deal with this matter in the bipartisan way in which those of us who were delegates, both Republicans and Democrats, tried to deal with it in San Francisco.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from New Jersey realizes, does he not, that there are many of us on this side of the aisle who feel exactly as he feels, in wanting to keep politics completely out of our foreign policy, and, even though there may be some misunderstandings occasionally, there are many of us who expect to work with him in arriving at a bipartisan foreign policy on which we can all stand and upon which we can all agree.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. In committees on which I have served with him, notably during the joint hearings of the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, I have felt that he has always expressed that point of view, and he has been a champion of the right approach to bipartisanship in these critical times.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Before the Gavel There Was the Spade," by Mr. Arthur Krock, to which I have referred, and which appeared in the New York Times of September 11, 1951, be inserted in the body of the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—BEFORE THE GAVEL THERE WAS THE SPADE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 10.—The President's praise of the steersmanship of the Japanese Peace Treaty conference at San Francisco by his Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, reflects a general opinion here which is shared by many Republican critics of our foreign policy, as Senator KNOWLAND revealed in the Senate today. Mr. Acheson's firmness and skill in dealing with Mr. Gromyko's effort to frighten the non-Communist world from going through with its program was a vital factor in assuring that the conference would proceed according to schedule, and, in view of the more extreme Republican attacks on the Secretary of State, Mr. Truman's comment was natural.

#### THE REPUBLICAN CONTRIBUTION

But if the President permits or encourages the impression that he thinks Mr. Acheson's contribution played the principal part in saving the conference from "ruin," or if administration Democrats make claims to this degree, the path of the Japanese peace treaty toward ratification may become obstructed by partisan politics and an unfortunate dispute over credits may soil the campaign of 1952. That is because, for the first time in a major foreign policy enterprise by Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson, the foundation of success was laid by a Republican. Had it not been for the spade of John Foster Dulles the gavel of Mr. Acheson could not have been wielded as it was at San Francisco.

From the moment the seed of the treaty was given for nurture to Mr. Dulles until he put the firm fruit into the hands of the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles maintained close consultation with leaders of his own party in Congress and outside it. Also, as he publicly testified, had not General MacArthur prepared the soil the seed would not have sprouted. Moreover, there are two Republican signatures to the treaty—those of Mr. Dulles and Senator WILEY; Senator BRIDGES signed the bilateral security pact with Japan; and Senators SMITH and HICKENLOOPER were official participants in the proceedings at San Francisco.

#### TIME FOR TROUBLE

The excellent purpose of this was to restore to foreign policy that actual bipartisanship which in this administration has been largely a matter of words. Paraphrasing Harold E. Stassen, this was a rare instance in which the Republicans were brought in at the take-off instead of being besought for aid only after the crash landing. If an effort is now made to put the Japanese peace treaty and the successful conference in the category of exclusive achievements by the administration, partisanship at the expense of the pact will be forced into its consideration by the Senate.

Though the majority leader, Mr. McFARLAND, promised to try to have the treaty approved by the Senate at this session, that plan has been virtually abandoned for several reasons. One is the crowd of legislative priorities in a Congress which is set on adjourning early in October. Another stems from the problem of shifting over in Japan from the status of occupation to the joint security arrangement, a problem complicated by the war in Korea. This has evoked a feeling at the Pentagon that 2 or 3 months, at least, should elapse before the fundamental change in Japan's international situation is established by law. This means Senate action will not come until next session.

#### WAITING WITH MONKEY WRENCHES

In the meantime, if the treaty gets into partisan American politics that will be the atmosphere in which it will be debated by the Senate. Many who have worked hard for the accomplishment it represents greatly fear the consequences this would entail not only on the text of the fact itself but on Governments which associated themselves with the United States at San Francisco despite many misgivings. In Asia particularly, these consequences could be disastrous.

Though the Republicans mentioned above were parties to the evolution of the treaty, and Mr. Dulles did exactly 100 percent of the groundwork which culminated in the division of 49 nations to 3 at San Francisco, there is a Republican group which only awaits an opportunity to assail some of the terms. As always, too, when Moscow is on one side and the free world on the other, Communists and their sympathizers in the United States will follow any destructive leads which may be offered. Nothing would better suit critics and enemies of the treaty than to see the Democrats and the Republicans embroiled over an issue of political credit and the treaty itself projected into the partisanship of the 1952 campaign.

#### TIME WILL TELL

For all these reasons the issue should be avoided by friends of the treaty, by friends of Mr. Dulles and the Republicans who aided him, by friends of General MacArthur, who gave the treaty his broad approval, and by supporters of the Administration and Secretary Acheson. The responsible persons among them are the only ones who can project it, chief among them Mr. Truman. The issue cannot be importantly posed by the minor professionals in the "Get-Acheson" movement, in the Republican Party, or in the ranks known to be sympathetic to communism.

The next few weeks will disclose whether this great bipartisan attainment in American foreign policy is to be treated as such, and thus safeguarded from dangers which could come from partisan expansions of the President's comment.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4914) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. COLE of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 15. An act to amend section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code;

H. R. 319. An act to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by providing for treble damage actions;

H. R. 581. An act for the relief of Isabel Tabit;

H. R. 627. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde;

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shizuko Yamane;

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of Antonios Charalambou;

H. R. 982. An act for the relief of Willem Smits;

H. R. 1454. An act for the relief of George Crisan;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Hoshi Kazuo;

H. R. 2158. An act for the relief of Sister M. Crocifissa and Sister M. Reginalda;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of Sister M. Leonida;

H. R. 2179. An act for the relief of Ilona Agoston;

H. R. 2292. An act for the relief of Jai Young Lee;

H. R. 2514. An act for the relief of Maria Theresa Stancola;

H. R. 2787. An act for the relief of Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards);

H. R. 3176. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the life and perpetuate the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington," approved August 7, 1946;

H. R. 3214. An act for the relief of Irene Senutovitch;

H. R. 3463. An act to authorize the transfer of certain naval vessels;

H. R. 3819. An act for the relief of Ann Elisabeth (Diana Elizabeth) Reingruber;

H. R. 3823. An act for the relief of Shozo Ichiwawa;

H. R. 3957. An act to provide that certain functions of the Comptroller of the Currency which relate to building associations organized in, or doing business in, the District of Columbia, shall hereafter be performed by the Home Loan Bank Board, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4024. An act to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4038. An act for the relief of Dr. George Alexandros Chronakis;

H. R. 4113. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act to provide that distinctive mark or insignia shall not be required in the uniforms worn by members of the National Guard of the United States, both Army and Air;

H. R. 4260. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the Quartermaster Experimental Fuel Station, Pike County, Mo.;

H. R. 4443. An act to prevent the entry of certain mollusks into the United States; and

H. R. 4674. An act authorizing the Secretary of State to continue Hervé J. L'Heureux to serve as Chief of the Visa Division for an additional year commencing September 1, 1951.

#### CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4914) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 12, 1951, he



presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 15) to amend section 215 of title 18 of the United States Code.

#### INCREASE IN BASIC RATES OF COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I take this occasion to say that the junior Senator from Nevada approves the report of the committee on Calendar 531, Senate bill 622, a bill to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes. The committee, in its report, states that, having considered the bill, it reports favorably thereon, with amendments, and recommends that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. President, this slight raise in pay, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, is long overdue. However, in the opinion of the junior Senator, even with this raise, the compensation does not quite overtake the current inflation. I simply want to go on record at this time as favoring the increase.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Incidental expenses of the Army," on page 18, line 22, after the word "sites", to strike out "\$187,914,000" and insert "\$194,514,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before we proceed with the rather important bill, it seems to me we should have a quorum call. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator temporarily withhold the suggestion?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I withhold the suggestion temporarily.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota wanted to inquire what amendment was pending. The Chair stated the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was the amendment on page 18, line 22, striking out the numerals "\$187,914,000" and inserting "\$194,514,000." If there is any objection to it, the Chair will rescind the announcement that the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. There is objection. I should like to have an explanation of the amendment, but I would have no objection to having a quorum call before the explanation is made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Nixon
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Connor
Cain	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Smathers
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Eaton	Long	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Underwood
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	McCarthy	Welker
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
Fulbright	McFarland	Williams
George	McKellar	Young
Gillette	McMahon	
Green	Millikin	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business in connection with their attendance at the conference for the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 18, line 22, in reference to which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has asked for an explanation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in this amendment the Senate committee added \$6,600,000 to the amount appropriated by the House. The budget estimate was \$198,914,000. It was reduced by the House to \$187,914,000. The committee was impressed with the testimony offered on behalf of the Quartermaster Service that we should restore funds sufficient to provide for the employment of 1,592 employees out of a total reduction of 5,550 made by the House. In other words, we did not restore all the personnel cut requested in the budget and made by the House, so we recommended \$4,600,000 for the additional personnel. They will be used in quarter-

master depots for procurement officers, in market centers, and in inspection service throughout the country, for quartermasters' supplies in Army areas, and in overseas commands.

The evidence presented to the committee indicated that during 1952 the Quartermaster General would have to handle approximately 4,123,000 tons of supplies as compared with 3,915,000 tons in 1951. There has been an effort to coordinate the storage and handling of various kinds of equipment and supplies. The Bureau of Ordnance, the Signal Corps, the medical staff, and the transportation sections, all have a part in some of these general depots, and because of the increased tonnage required to be handled, it would seem necessary to restore the portion of the personnel which had been reduced by the House.

In addition to that, \$2,000,000 of the sum which we restored for other than personal services is to be applied to the return to the United States of the remains of deceased military personnel from Korea.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Did the Senator state what the figure for this purpose was in fiscal 1951?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The appropriation for this purpose in 1951 was \$172,235,000 plus.

Mr. CASE. In other words, the figure of \$194,514,000 would represent an increase of about \$22,000,000 over last year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be an increase from \$172,000,000 plus to \$194,000,000 plus; yes, about \$22,000,000 plus. But I should point out that there has been a 40-percent increase in the number of troops.

Mr. CASE. I am sure that no Member of the Senate would want in any way to limit the funds that would be necessary for the return of the remains of deceased soldiers from Korea. However, it is difficult for me to believe that the figure approved by the other body would have contemplated eliminating those funds. The \$187,914,000 suggested by the House would provide an increase of \$15,000,000 over the amount appropriated for the current year, and it would seem to me that that would be a very substantial increase.

Mr. President, I should like to have a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the committee, on page 18, line 22, to strike out "\$187,914,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$194,514,000." [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it. The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, in line 23, it is proposed to insert the following proviso: "Provided, That expenditures of appropriations contained in this act for public informational activities of the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$10,950,000 including

pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to such activities."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on yesterday, in the course of his remarks, the Senator from Wyoming made the statement, which is printed on page 11135 of yesterday's RECORD, which reads as follows:

I know there are places in this bill where great cuts can be made.

At that time I asked the Senator from Wyoming to advise the Senate as to the places where great cuts could be made, and received the assurance that we would be told a little later in the discussion. I was unable to remain in the Chamber until the Senator from Wyoming finished, but in going over his remarks of yesterday I do not find where he pointed out any place where great cuts could be made in this appropriation bill. I am wondering if the Senator is prepared to tell us at this time just where cuts could be made. If he knows—and we have the word of the chairman of the subcommittee that great cuts could be made in the bill, and he has not pointed out where we could make them adequately—it seems to me we would be justified in supporting the motion of my colleague from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], that the bill be recommitted with instructions to make the cuts. But if it can be pointed out now where the cuts can be made, we may not have to do that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Vermont, let me say that in the first place I was under the impression that I had indicated precisely what I had meant. The Senator left the Chamber, and it is quite possible that the explanation was not quite as full as he might desire. I have a distinct recollection of saying that the naval program calls for the maintenance and supply of a fleet of 1,162 vessels, and I said, I am not the person to say to what extent that should be reduced.

It is quite possible that it could be reduced. I went to the extent of going personally to the Pentagon Building, sitting down with the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—all of this I detailed yesterday—and pointing out the query that was in my mind, and I thought would be in the minds of other Senators, as to whether or not so great a Navy would be actually needed. That is a place where a great cut can be made, if we should decide not to maintain 1,162 vessels. But I am now of the opinion that it would be a reckless thing for me to do to recommend that a cut in the Navy should be made while the tension on the world front is so great as it is.

Then I had in mind the appropriation for ordnance. The committee did make a cut of something like \$256,000,000 in tank construction because we felt with respect to this particular type of tank that it could be postponed until a future time.

Ordnance and repairs for naval vessels—

Mr. AIKEN. Were those cuts made after this bill was printed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator's remarks referred to this bill as it is now before the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A cut of \$256,000,000 in the item I mentioned is in this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. But the Senator said, "I know there are places in this bill where great cuts can be made."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am trying my best to tell the Senator of them. The statement was made against the background, I will say to the Senator from Vermont, that war is destruction; war is waste. But, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations having in charge the armed services bill and having listened to all the testimony, I am not willing to substitute my guess now that we could cut \$3,000,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000 here or there. I feel it simply cannot be done. That is all I had in mind when I was addressing the Senate yesterday.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am quite disappointed that the Senator from Wyoming has no specific recommendations as to where cuts can be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I had any specific recommendations beyond those which we have accomplished, they would certainly have been presented in the committee and would have been set forth in the committee's report.

Mr. AIKEN. Because the Senator certainly aroused my hopes when he said, and I quote him:

I know there are places in this bill where great cuts can be made.

I had hoped that he was going to point out some places where some substantial savings could be made. I am sorry that is not the fact, however.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We could make cuts in the military strength, in the size of the Army. The Army has been held down. A few months ago Senators upon this floor and upon the radio and elsewhere were saying, "We ought to have a 12,000,000-man Army," or a 6,000,000-man Army. We have here a program for 3,500,000 soldiers. There has been much argument about the size of our Air Force. Personally I am convinced that air power must be expanded, not only in the United States Air Force, but in the Navy. Cuts could be made there, but I think they would be reckless cuts.

Mr. AIKEN. Inasmuch as the Senator from Wyoming has no specific recommendations to make, I should like to pursue a little further the colloquy which I had with him a couple of days ago, with regard to what prompted the Army to sponsor a mystery serial radio program called *The Shadow*, a very intriguing program, in which *The Shadow*, by a flip of the wrist, becomes invisible. He hears all and sees all, and never exposes himself. He always rescues his girl friend from a horrible death at the last minute, and nabs the villain.

It seems to me that, rather than putting on such radio programs as that, if the armed services would employ *The Shadow* himself, we might dispense with a great many of the men we now have in the Armed Forces, and use *The Shadow* instead. But what justification is there for the armed services putting on such popular radio programs, which up to

that time had been sponsored by private interests? The Senator said he would try to get some information on that subject. I wonder if he has any.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I pursued that inquiry, because I was quite surprised by the statement of the Senator from Vermont. It seemed to me to be of doubtful wisdom for the Army to sponsor such a program as that. I think I stated at the time that if it were done, I supposed that it had been done in the promotion of the directive which was given to the Army by the Congress in passing the renewal of the selective service bill, the manpower bill, a year ago, to make an extraordinary effort to bring about voluntary enlistments. I have a report from Mr. Clayton Fritchey, Director of the Office of Public Information in the Department of Defense. He says:

*The Shadow* was sponsored by the Army and Air Force for 13 weeks, January 7 through April 1951. It was a one-half show presented weekly over some 524 stations of the Mutual Broadcasting System.

Under the Army-Air Force recruiting program, financed by funds appropriated by the Congress, a contract was let by the Grant Advertising Co., Inc., 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., which has the over-all Army and Air Force contract, for a sum of approximately \$150,000.

This program, at the time, was one of five radio and TV shows presented at various times and under different combinations of stations and networks, and aimed at varying types of listening audiences in order to make the widest possible appeal to young men and women to join the Army and Air Force.

The Grant agency has, in all such cases, made recommendations for various shows and was given Army and Air Force approval before award of any contract within its over-all and general contract.

Funds expended were from the fiscal 1951 budget for Army-Air Force recruiting and personnel procurement and were in no way connected with public information funds.

CLAYTON FRITCHEY, Director.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for making that information available for the RECORD, because it does clear up the question as to whether or not the Army actually was sponsoring this program, *The Shadow*. It appears that it was sponsoring it, at a cost of \$150,000 for 13 weeks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The cost of this program constituted only a part of the general over-all fund.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood, as the Senator read the memorandum, that it referred only to the program called *The Shadow*.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. The statement is:

Under the Army-Air Force recruiting program, financed by funds appropriated by the Congress, a contract was let by the Grant Advertising Co., Inc., 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., which has the over-all Army and Air Force contract for a sum of approximately \$150,000.

I interpreted that to mean that the \$150,000 was the over-all cost of all the Army and Navy programs.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not say that the Senator is not correct, but that was not my construction of the language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Again, I say that it is of very doubtful wisdom to sponsor shows of that kind. But the thinking of



the advertising agency apparently was that there were many people, like the Senator from Vermont, who listen to this program, and that perhaps they would be interested.

Mr. AIKEN. I listen to it. That is why I know about it. The question arises in my mind, however, as to the necessity of putting on elaborate radio and television programs to stimulate recruiting when the draft law is in effect. But I see that the Army puts the blame on Congress again, because it is said that this program was put on because Congress appropriated the money for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let us make the matter clear now, before the Senator goes further. He says that it seems rather useless that such a program should be carried out while the draft law is in effect. Let me read from the draft law. I read from section 20, under the heading "Effective date":

The Secretary of the Army for the Army and the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy for the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard, are hereby authorized and directed to initiate and carry forward an intensive voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strengths.

So the Congress of the United States instructed the Department of Defense to carry on such a campaign when that law was passed.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not hear the slightest reference to The Shadow or even to radio programs in the section of the law from which the Senator read.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The details of the program were not outlined. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that by the rules of the Senate the Appropriations Committee is forbidden to write legislative riders into appropriation bills. If it is desired to curtail the expense of carrying on a voluntary-enlistment program so that fewer men will have to be drafted, the place to carry that story is before the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The Army says, in effect, that if the Congress had not appropriated the money it would not have put this mystery-serial program over the air on Sunday afternoons. It seems to me that the Army has given us a cue to the remedy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, even though the distinguished Senator from Vermont enjoyed the program called The Shadow, does he think that the taxpayers of the United States should be expected to put up the funds so that The Shadow can be put on for the Senator's enjoyment?

Mr. AIKEN. The pleasure which the Senator from Vermont got from listening to The Shadow was considerably alloyed at the end when he found that he was helping to pay for it through taxation. I think there are probably

private interests who would be willing to continue this program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Along the line of the statement of the Senator from Wyoming, it is my understanding from the armed services and from the conferences on the unification bill and the Selective Service bill, that the best soldiers are volunteers. A volunteer who enters the service on his own volition contemplates a longer term of enlistment, with the hope that he may remain and make the Army or Navy a career. A drafted soldier is in for a shorter period of time, and it is reasonably clear that he will leave the service once his term is over.

Therefore, it is more efficient, more economical, and better judgment to secure the service of a man who joins the Armed Forces because he wants to do so, and will serve for a longer period of time.

With respect to the money which is spent for advertising, I have never listened to this particular program, and I very seldom listen to any such programs.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator should listen sometime. It is a very good mystery program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I conclude by saying that over a long period of time any money which is spent for publicity for procurement of volunteers, if well spent by competent people, is of value to the taxpayers. I do not say that the program to which the Senator from Vermont has referred was that kind of program.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that we should have as many volunteers as possible. However, there is not a college in this country where the boys do not know that they can volunteer for the Army if they want to do so. There are recruiting offices in every town of any size. It is absolutely unnecessary to put on multi-million-dollar programs—and that is what the total cost must amount to for all the armed services—in order to induce enlistments. I hope the programs are not put on for the purpose of keeping in right with the advertising medium they employ.

I am wondering about another factor. The contract for advertising was placed with an advertising concern in Chicago. There would be perhaps as much as \$22,500 which would go outright to one advertising concern as a fee. It seems to me that here is one place where we could save some money by stopping the elaborate multi-million-dollar advertising, publicity, and propaganda campaigns of our Government agencies.

I understand that the Department of the Treasury is sponsoring the Sammy Kaye orchestra. That must cost even more than The Shadow and other programs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Vermont aware of the fact that the pres-

ent budget contains an item of \$3,000,000 for advertising on the part of the Department of Defense?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has stated that it would be beyond the power of the Committee on Appropriations to put a rider on the bill. That is correct. But certainly the Appropriations Committee is under no obligation to provide funds just because there is an authorization for a certain purpose. The Appropriations Committee repeatedly denies funds for projects for which authorizations have been made.

As an example of the way the so-called directive is being followed, I should like to read to the Senate a letter which was written by a sergeant of the recruiting service of the Army and Air Force on the 16th of July 1951. It is addressed to a young man who has received his preinduction notice. It should be borne in mind that this letter is from the recruiting service:

DEAR SIR: The Selective Service Board of—

The name of the town—

states that your preinduction draft notice will be in the mail within the next three (3) days.

Did you know that you can still volunteer—

That sentence, "Did you know that you can still volunteer," is capitalized and underscored—

for the Air Force or the Army before—

The word "before" is underscored—

you receive your preinduction notice? After receipt of your preinduction draft notice, you will be ineligible to volunteer for any branch of service.

Would it be possible for you to come into this office within a few hours after receiving this letter? We believe we have something that will be of vital interest to you.

Sincerely yours.

It is signed by the recruiting sergeant.

The point I wish to make is that we spend money to maintain the recruiting service and it is writing letters to boys after they get their preinduction notices, informing them that if they come to the recruiting officer he can offer them something of interest.

The suggestion that ought to be made in the interest of economy is that the entire job of recruiting personnel for the armed services should be left to the local draft boards. If it were, credits for volunteers could be adjusted each month. It is a known fact that there is a lag between the time an enlistment takes place and when the draft board gets credit for the enlistment.

After a draft board has sent out its preinduction notices, if the recruiting service comes along and succeeds in herding boys into the service by this kind of solicitation, the draft board must go through its work again and send out other notices in order to meet its quota. Furthermore, the board does not get credit for its volunteers until several months thereafter. If the recruiting were handled by the local draft boards, they could accept volunteers, and thus

save a great deal of money on this expensive recruiting program.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from South Dakota has brought out a very salient point. This morning I received a message that the chairman of a certain draft board had resigned his position because of the very point which has been made by the Senator from South Dakota. It seems to me that the spending of millions of dollars for propaganda purposes by the armed services is entirely unwarranted and has very little to do with securing the number of men necessary to keep the Army up to proper strength.

Mr. CASE. Under date of July 19, 1951, I received a letter from Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, which gives the number of persons who are engaged in recruiting at the present time—Army and Air Force, 9,260; Navy, 3,324; Marine Corps, 1,793. The total number of persons engaged in recruiting at the present time is 14,377. The recruiting could be handled through the local draft boards on a volunteer basis. I believe that the boys should have an opportunity to volunteer if they want to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is one of several subjects which the committee and its members have had under consideration with the Department, and I can report to the Senate that as a result of some of our conversations a reevaluation of the enlistment program is now in process. It may be that it can be cut down. As I stated on the opening day, I personally feel that in many instances there is overstaffing of various departments. I assure the Senator from South Dakota that in the hearings which the committee held day after day, from the 7th of June to the 28th of August, it was not possible to go into every contract which may have been made. We intend to pursue that subject. It is my purpose to call several branches of the armed services before us for further detailed statements of the steps they are taking to reduce expenditures in the matter of personnel.

Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg, who was appointed at the request of the retiring Secretary of Defense, General Marshall, whose praises rang through this Chamber this morning, has undertaken by directive to every branch of the armed services to make personnel cuts. An order for a 5-percent cut was issued.

I know that I speak for the whole committee when I say that the committee will continue to press for the utmost economy in these expenditures. It ought to be clear that we labor under a very heavy handicap when a basic policy for the armed services is prescribed by a legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee then undertakes to review appropriations which are made to carry out the mandate of Congress.

Of course, it is true that the Appropriations Committee at any time and that Congress at any time can say "We will not appropriate X dollars for this project or for that project. So much is authorized for this project, but

the expenditures in our opinion should be thus and so." This committee has done that in numerous instances. I wish to assure the Senator that the committee has not been derelict in its scrutiny of these appropriations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I realize how impossible it is for the Appropriations Committee, with the limited number of employees at its command, to keep up with the thousands of statisticians and other persons who are employed by Government agencies in attempting to secure the largest possible appropriations from the Congress.

I raise this point of the unnecessary expenditures by the Armed Forces at levels and amounts which we nonprofessionals can more easily understand because it seems to me that if unnecessary expenditures are occurring at the lower levels and in the lesser amounts, there is no reason to believe that the same agencies would be any more careful in regard to the larger amounts which may be made available to them.

I am happy that the Senator from Wyoming has indicated his intention to keep hammering on this line, and to squeeze out the unnecessary and wasteful expenditures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That certainly will be my purpose.

Let me point out that one of the members of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee is also the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; I refer to the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. He and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] have introduced a bill, one purpose of which is to expand the staff of the Appropriations Committee so that it may supervise these expenditures.

All I have to say to the Senator from Vermont is, have a heart for the labors of the chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, whose nose has been on this grindstone without interruption since the 7th day of June of this year, seeking in every way known to him to interrogate every witness who came before the committee, and to spread upon the record the fullest possible information as to the manner in which the money of the people of the United States is being expended.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senator from Wyoming that I do have a heart and a great deal of sympathy for the chairmen of the subcommittees and the chairmen of the full committees of the Senate.

I wish it fully understood, however, that my remarks are not to be understood in any way as advocating a great expansion of the staffs of the committees of the Congress, because some of the committees already have larger staffs than they need.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the printed hearings on this bill run to 1,910 pages. I call attention to that fact because anyone who has ever dealt with appropriation bill hearings knows that 1,910 pages of testimony cannot be taken in connection with an appropriation bill without having the nose of the chairman of the

subcommittee handling the bill to the grindstone for a long, long time.

Another aspect to be considered in connection with a military appropriation bill is that a great deal of the testimony taken in regard to such a bill—testimony in regard to the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy—is off the record, with the result that the printed record of the hearings on such a bill is only a part of the entire story, and much more than appears in the printed record is given off the record, for much of the material submitted to the committee is composed of classified tables, charts, and so forth. Therefore, the printed hearings do not anywhere nearly tell the full story.

No one who reads the record of these debates should in any way receive the impression that the Members of the Senate are in any way unappreciative of the long labors and the diligent work done by the committee. I take off my hat to the subcommittee, which has taken 1,910 printed pages of hearings, as well as great amounts of testimony and information which have been received off the record.

At the same time, Mr. President, it is the responsibility of the Members of the Senate to request such information as occurs to them to be proper for consideration in connection with an appropriation bill. In speaking at this time, following the remarks made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I wish to call attention to the fact that 14,377 persons employed in the recruiting service constitute a fairly good-sized division. Of course, it is true that many of those who are engaged in the recruiting service are either disabled veterans or are soldiers who have disability of some sort or another which makes them unavailable for service in the field. But that such persons are available for and are engaged in the recruiting service is evidence of the fact that they are also suitable for almost any type of office work elsewhere, and in such work they might very well replace many members of the Armed Forces who have been placed in the service by the draft boards; and in that way the number of those engaged in the active field service might be considerably increased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment inserting a proviso at the bottom of page 18 and the top of page 19.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have an amendment directed to this section of the bill, on pages 17 and 18, but referring to the entire rate of appropriations in the various lines. If this committee amendment is adopted, I wonder whether it then would be out of order for me to submit my amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may make a statement, let me say that I feel that adoption of this committee amendment would not interfere at all with the amendment the Senator from Illinois intends to submit, for the amendment now before us is a limitation upon the appropriation. The amendment



raising the sum to \$194,000,000 has already been adopted for the third time, but I shall be glad, after we have completed the committee amendments, to ask unanimous consent, if it should be necessary, that any additional amendment the Senator may wish to offer may be considered. The question, Mr. President, is on the proviso beginning in line 23. I thought that had been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment which was passed over, on page 18, line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Departmental salaries and expenses—Salaries, Department of the Army," on page 34, line 11, after the word "service", to strike out "\$3,625,000" and insert "\$3,723,400."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the same understanding apply as to this amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; it goes right on through the bill. I have seen some of the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois, and when they are presented, I want the Senator to have an opportunity for full discussion. There will be no effort to shut off or to prevent discussion.

A day or so ago the Senator from South Dakota desired an explanation of various increases which are made on this page. I shall be very happy to explain them, amendment by amendment, or to explain them all en bloc, whichever may seem desirable.

The \$98,000 which we added for the Office of the Secretary of the Army is for the specific purpose of enabling the Secretary to carry on the renegotiation program. There has already been a 5-percent reduction in civilian personnel, and the request was for the restoration of a sum sufficient to provide 12 additional negotiators in the Armed Services Renegotiation Board. The Board, with this increase, will have a staff of less than 35, which, compared with the staff of negotiators in World War II, represents a very great reduction. At that time there were as many as 150 persons employed in the renegotiation. Our committee felt that there was no question about the wisdom and economy of allowing the additional personnel, to carry on the renegotiation of these vast contracts.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is the one who introduced the word "renegotiation" into the Federal statutes dealing with excess profits.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is to be complimented on that provision.

Mr. CASE. He would therefore hardly be in a position to object to a provision to provide the required number of renegotiators, but it seems to me it is important to have the increases in the bill explained, so the record will be clear as to what they are for. I would ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, did not the House provide any funds for personnel for the renegotiation staff of the Price Adjustment Board?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The estimate for this purpose was \$3,723,400. The House committee cut the appropriation to \$3,625,000, and the committee felt that that cut was unwarranted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, scarcely any money can be expended which will return larger dividends than the money spent for the purpose of providing a sufficient number of members of the renegotiation staff, through whose work we shall undoubtedly get back some big returns.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was the feeling.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 34, line 15, to strike out "\$700,000" and insert "\$743,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with respect to this amendment, I again point out that the Congress, by the enactment of a law, imposed additional burdens and duties and responsibilities upon the Department of the Army. In the Eighty-first Congress, Public Law 506 was passed, which provides new appellate procedures for military personnel and enlisted personnel. There was a feeling that the judicial system of the military forces should be revised, and that enlisted personnel, haled before courts martial, should have an opportunity for a more clearly defined appellate procedure, so that they would have a clear opportunity to present their cases. The Judge Advocate General appeared before the committee and satisfied it that the restoration of \$43,000 was entirely justified. The increasing strength of the military department seemed to make this essential.

The 1952 estimate was \$761,000; the House cut it to \$700,000, a reduction of \$61,000, and we have restored \$43,000, solely for the purpose of implementing this appellate procedure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, line 15.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the pending bill, House bill 5054. My amendment would create a watchdog committee to check upon the expenditure of military appropriations. Mr. President \$61,000,000,000 is a tremendous sum. I doubt whether any person or any group can rightfully determine whether an appropriation of that magnitude is the exact amount which the military should have. But I believe that if we have a proper inspection of how the funds are expended, we might in that manner safeguard this appropriation and safeguard the taxpayers against unwise expenditures by any of the military forces. We would then know definitely that if there were an expenditure either for this or that purpose, which exceeded the necessities of the case, or was not in line with common sense, we could immediately stop the military from making the expenditure, and have an accounting. In my opinion, such an investigation, such watchdog activities over the expenditure of the \$61,000,000,-

000 and any additional funds which may be appropriated for the military, would have a wholesome effect upon those who are charged with the responsibility of spending such huge sums of money.

The proposed committee is in line with the watchdog committee in existence during World War II, known as the Truman committee. I know how that committee proceeded to examine the installations and to determine how Federal funds were expended for military purposes during those years, and it had a most wholesome effect on keeping expenditures within the bounds of good common sense.

So, Mr. President, I offer this amendment in order that it may lie on the table until such time as we shall have completed the consideration of the committee amendments, and I would then like to have it taken up for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. THYE. I should say that the amendment is offered for myself and the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I shall be most happy to yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Minnesota would consent to have the junior Senator from New Jersey associate himself with the two other Senators in offering this amendment and with its purposes.

Mr. THYE. I should be delighted to have the junior Senator from New Jersey associated with us. Last May I offered the same legislative proposal in the form of a resolution. I have not been able to obtain action on the resolution, and it is for that reason that I now offer it as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it the same provision which was submitted with reference to a staff for the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. THYE. Yes. It provides for a "watchdog" committee created through the Appropriations Committee. We would then have a staff of qualified auditors who could proceed to determine how the funds were expended. Personally, as a member of the committee, I find myself of the conviction that it is very difficult for members of the committee to familiarize themselves with all the items in an appropriation bill. Therefore, as a member of the subcommittee and of the full Committee on Appropriations, I find it necessary to approve certain amendments, even though I recognize there is a need for economy in Federal expenditures. I question whether anyone on the committee is wise enough to say whether the appropriation for this or that activity of the Defense Department is in excess of what is actually required, but I believe that if we had proper investigation and inspection in connection with how the funds are expended, we would safeguard ourselves against appropriating funds in excess of what would be fair

and necessary in developing our national defense in such manner as to assure us of security against an invading enemy or against any military aggression on the part of an enemy.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has been in sympathy with the idea of having a staff which could properly supervise some of the activities of government in order that the Appropriations Committee might understand, from the legislative point of view, what is going on and how the money is being expended. I have advocated it many times, not only in the committee, with the Senator from Minnesota, but on the floor of the Senate.

Personally, I should like to associate my name with the Senator's amendment, because I feel that it is very urgent that such a committee be formed in order that we may do a better job in connection with appropriations. As the amount of the appropriations increases—and I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee holds the same view, as he indicated there is another bill to increase the size of the service, and so forth—we shall need all the help and assistance we can get in the committee in order that we may bring the facts to the people.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on the Armed Services of the Committee on Appropriations, of which subcommittee the Senator from Wyoming is chairman, I attended most of the committee sessions, and I wish to say that the subcommittee chairman could not have been more searching in the questions he asked of the various representatives of the military, the Atomic Energy Commission, and others who appeared before the committee, in an endeavor to find whether there was any possibility of reducing the budget requests. I would say that all who had the opportunity to be in attendance at the committee sessions were most appreciative and were willing to offer their thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee for the splendid job he was doing in endeavoring to ascertain whether the appropriations should be reduced below the budget recommendation. I know that when the final recommendations came from the subcommittee there was not one item in the appropriation bill which had not had complete study in an effort to ascertain whether it represented the bare minimum that should be allowed.

Personally, I could not make any suggestion as to how we should reduce the items in the appropriation bill and, at the same time, assure ourselves that we were developing a national defense which would provide security for the Nation in the event an aggressor started an action which would injure the welfare of the people of the Nation. I feel that I must vote against amendments proposing a reduction in certain items, because I believe it is necessary that we should develop a national defense which is adequate and which will prevent any aggressor from inaugurating any movement which would bring on world war III. If our enemies know we are strong, they will fear to start any action against us, but when we appropriate such a sum

as \$61,000,000,000, we need to inspect and investigate every dollar expended.

I recall that the able and distinguished Senator from Michigan called to our attention offices which had been so elaborately decorated that it bordered almost on the ridiculous. That was during World War II. We do not want a recurrence of any such expenditures. I believe it would have a most wholesome effect upon all who have the responsibility of expending funds, if it were known that there was a committee of the Senate as proposed by my amendment, that would examine the records and books to ascertain whether the funds had been unwisely expended, and that if they had been unwisely expended, there would have to be an accounting made. That would have a wholesome effect on those who have charge of exercising economy in expenditures. I think it would save the country a great deal of money in the course of the next 2 years while we are so greatly expanding appropriations for our national defense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks. He sat diligently, for long hours, listening to the testimony which was presented to the subcommittee. I am very grateful for the sentiments which the Senator has just expressed.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Wyoming had those statements duly and rightfully coming to him.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his very objective and worth-while effort, and to express the hope that when his amendment is considered it will receive the overwhelming support of the Senate, because, as the Senator has well said, the appropriation involves approximately \$61,000,000,000, and if we approve any substantial part of that amount we must be very careful as to how the money is expended in order to be sure that every cent is properly accounted for.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am most happy to know that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] would like to join with me as a cosponsor of my amendment to the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 34, line 18, after the word "General," it is proposed to strike out "\$9,625,000" and insert "\$9,875,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On the same page, in line 20, after the word "Transportation," it is proposed to strike out "\$3,800,000" and insert "\$4,024,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may we have a statement about that amendment? It relates to the Office of the Chief of Transportation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment has to do with the Office of the Chief of Transportation of the Department of the Army. It should be understood that the task of the Chief of Transportation is one of the largest and most onerous that is carried by any member of the armed services. The transportation involves the shipment of material by rail, by motor, by air, by inland waterway, and by all combined systems of transportation. It is a worldwide activity. The number of loadings during fiscal year 1951 amounted to 1,057,000. The number of short tons transported amounted to 10,572,000. This will have to be increased during the fiscal year 1952. The figure proposed by the Senate committee is an increase of \$224,000 over the figure approved by the House. The estimate was for \$4,024,373. The House allowed \$3,800,000. Our committee added a sufficient amount to make the sum \$4,024,000. This will allow for 60 positions in the office of the Chief of Transportation which, as the general in command aptly said, is the nerve center of our world-wide transportation system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 35, line 1, after the word "Ordnance," it is proposed to strike out "\$6,500,000" and insert "\$6,750,000."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I noted with considerable interest that the one point in the bill at which the Senate committee proposed a reduction was in ordnance service and supplies. That was the notable exception to all the other changes in the bill. The other changes were all increases. Under "Ordnance service and supplies," the House had recommended \$8,307,500,000, and the Senate committee proposed \$8,076,056,430, or a reduction of \$231,443,570 below the House figure. Now, however, in dealing with these special funds for the departmental salaries, there is proposed an increase of \$250,000 above the House figure. It is a little difficult for me to understand why the funds for the salaries should be increased by a quarter of a million dollars, whereas the funds for the ordnance service itself were reduced by \$231,000,000. I should like to have an explanation on that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to supply it. The reduction in the appropriation for ordnance, to which the Senator has referred, is the one to which I made allusion yesterday and again earlier today. We reduced the appropriation for ordnance \$200,000,000-plus by eliminating a certain item of procurement. It had nothing to do with personnel. The Senator from Michigan



[Mr. FERGUSON], who is the ranking Republican member of the committee, and the Senator from Wyoming felt, upon examination, or upon hearing the testimony, that there was a particular item, an armored personnel carrier, which might very well be eliminated for the present until it had received further study. So we eliminated that item. That is merely a cut in procurement. But the huge expenditure for ordnance still requires a substantial force to handle the work. The 1952 estimate for the departmental salaries for this objective was \$6,867,000. The House committee reduced that to \$6,500,000. The Department of the Army requested the restoration of the full amount of the cut, namely, \$367,000. The Senate committee, instead of restoring the full amount, added \$250,000. So that we are granting less than was requested. They asked for 89 positions, and we are giving them about 60.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 35, line 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, line 19, after the word "expended", it is proposed to strike out "\$50,414,000" and to insert "\$51,657,000, of which \$1,243,000 shall be used for construction, installation, or repair of sewage facilities at the naval base, Newport, Rhode Island, and the remainder shall be available."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment? What was the estimate for this item?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have agreed with the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who wanted to make some remarks at this point, that if he would refrain from taking the floor until after these departmental items had been handled I would be glad, as always, to listen to him; and if the Senator from South Dakota will agree, I think we should wait now until the Senator from Washington has made the comments he desires to make.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am very grateful for what the Senator from Wyoming has just said. I would defer now in order that the explanation requested by the Senator from South Dakota might be given.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to make the explanation. On the floor with me are the Senators from Rhode Island, our distinguished and very able friend, the senior Senator from that State [Mr. GREEN], and our distinguished and very able friend, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

For several years there has been a serious situation with respect to the Navy yard at Newport. The sewage system there has been the source of very great pollution in those waters. On numerous occasions, the Senators from Rhode Island have sought to have an appropriate

tion which would enable the Department of the Navy to construct the works which ought to be provided to reduce the pollution. But there never was a budget estimate for the item. There was always delay. It was pointed out, when we talked about naval pollution, that the city of Newport itself was discharging sewage into the bay. As a result of this situation, which is harmful to the health of all who use these waters, military personnel and civilian personnel, the matter has been delayed for several years.

Last year, however, Congress passed an authorization bill for public works which included an authorization to carry out the program of removing this pollution. In the meantime the community of Newport, the State of Rhode Island itself, and certain subdivisions, as I understand, have themselves taken steps which the Senators from Rhode Island can explain in greater detail than I can, to attack this problem.

So now for the first time we have a joint operation between the Navy and the communities of Rhode Island to prevent this pollution. The representatives of the Navy appeared and testified before the committee and supported the amendment, but the chairman of the subcommittee must acknowledge that there is no budget estimate for this sum.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Did I correctly understand the chairman of the subcommittee to say that this item was included in an authorization bill passed last year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. CASE. It is not in the new public works bill, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. It is in the bill passed on June 27 of last year, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 43, beginning in line 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next committee amendment passed over was, under the heading "Reserve personnel requirements," on page 52, line 25, to strike out the "\$17,543,000", and insert "\$19,843,000."

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, Gen. George C. Marshall has resigned as Secretary of Defense. At the risk of being misunderstood—and I gladly run this risk—I want to let it be known that the announcement of General Marshall's resignation is extremely good news to the junior Senator from Washington. There is no personal prejudice, antagonism, or animosity in this feeling. I am officially, and as a citizen, deeply gratified to know that a distinguished soldier is leaving an assignment which no soldier should ever be selected to fill. Being advised that a civilian is to replace a soldier as the Secretary of Defense, I am moved to say to the Nation that their interests will be better managed and protected in the future.

The appointment of General Marshall to be Secretary of Defense was confirmed by the Senate of the United States on September 20, 1950. I worked against that nomination in the Armed Services Committee and I voted against that nomination in the Senate. My reason for so doing was, to my mind, both understandable and sound.

At no time did I say anything about General Marshall in the Senate which I did not say in General Marshall's presence within the committee. In both situations, I said the same thing; and I wish to repeat in literal form what I did say to General Marshall when he was called before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate less than a year ago.

The reference is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 11, at page 15178.

Mr. Chairman, there is but one observation I wish to make in the presence of General Marshall and the committee. I want to say to General Marshall that because he is a professional military man, and I like to point out that he is one of the most distinguished persons in the annals of American military history, who has been nominated for the post of Secretary of Defense, which I believe completely should be filled by a civilian, there is absolutely nothing I can or would do to secure this post for General Marshall. If General Marshall was a combination, which no man could possibly be, of the finest characteristics and abilities of Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, Wellington, Grant, Lee, Foch, Pershing, Eisenhower, and Bradley, I would not vote to confirm General Marshall as Secretary of Defense. In my opinion, America will not solve her problems by endeavoring to find a soldier, old or young, to carry out burdens which ought to be borne and conquered by civilian citizens. I wish, however, to state directly to General Marshall, that should the Armed Services Committee favor your nomination and if the Senate confirms it, as seems most likely, the Senator from Washington will stand always ready to be of assistance to your responsibilities in every conceivable way. On the assumption that you, General Marshall, will shortly become America's Secretary of Defense, I wish you well, sound health, and long life.

Since General Marshall took office on September 20, 1950, the Senator from Washington has been sympathetic to General Marshall's burdens and sought to lighten those burdens as best he could.

I did, however, become more and more concerned because a military man was occupying a post which could only adequately be filled by a civilian. General Marshall's overriding weakness as Secretary of Defense was a weakness over which he had no control. His life had been devoted to the military. He had been a soldier. He was a soldier. He will live out his years and die as a soldier. A good soldier, as General Marshall was, is a good citizen, but there are assignments which are beyond the capacity and training of any soldier. The post of Secretary of Defense is such an assignment.

I lived a lifetime in the 7 weeks of hearings conducted by the joint committee on the dismissal of General MacArthur and the military situation in the Far East. It was my business to study and constructively analyze the relationship of the Secretary of Defense to the

Military Establishment. This study increased my conviction that no military man should ever attempt to be the civilian head of the Department of Defense. It became obvious to me that the Joint Chiefs of Staff were to the Secretary of Defense what the general staff of a division, corps, or army is to the commanding general of those units. Nothing could be worse if our determination is to achieve and maintain a healthy balance between military and civilian interests within our Defense Establishment. When the Secretary of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff concurred in the President's ambition to dismiss General of the Army Douglas MacArthur without referring the question to the civilian Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, it was an admission that the Secretary of Defense had no understanding of the need for civilian control over the military. The Secretary of Defense, without any intention to create harm, ignored and treated those civilian Secretaries as though they were administrative subordinates and messenger boys. The Congress of the United States never determined all of the reasons involved in the dismissal of General MacArthur because the civilian Secretaries within the Defense Establishment were totally uninformed.

I trust that General Marshall will benefit from health and happiness in the years of his retirement. I wish him well as a person but, with what I conceive to be the best interests of my Nation in mind, I can only cheer because he has gone from an assignment in which he found himself beyond his depth.

The Senate confirmed the appointment of Gen. George Marshall to be the Secretary of Defense because the Senate, less than a year ago, considered him to be an indispensable man. The Senate rewrote the law of the land to make his appointment possible. That special law has outworn its usefulness in less than 1 year. I pray, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States will never again consider any human being to be indispensable, for history tells us—and we ought to know it to be a fact—that no individual is or can ever be indispensable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 52, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 57, line 22, after the word "tuition", to insert "specifically approved by the Secretary of the Department concerned."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senate is considering the amendment on page 55, beginning in line 17?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was agreed to yesterday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The amendment to strike the House provision was agreed to?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; with the explicit statement on behalf of members of the subcommittee, and other Senators who discussed the bill, that this whole problem will be reopened and thoroughly searched in conference. The members of the Committee on Appropriations are definitely of the feeling that there must be an improvement in the handling of the reservists, and we intend to work it out with the House managers to the best of our ability.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 57, line 22.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In connection with this amendment I believe the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had an amendment which he desired to offer. I therefore ask that consideration of the amendment go over until the Senator from Virginia can be called to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consideration of the amendment will be postponed.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 69, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 630. In order more effectively to administer the programs and functions of the Department of Defense, the President, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in the interest of national defense, may authorize, within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, 15 temporary positions to be placed in grades GS-17 and GS-18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act. Not more than eight of these positions shall be in grade GS-18. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that section went over, because I believe the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had planned to offer an amendment with respect to it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Senator from Michigan has reference to another amendment. The Senator from Virginia, after consultation, was satisfied with this amendment as it stands.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator from Wyoming like to go back to the other amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have asked that it be passed over until the Senator from Virginia arrives in the Chamber. If we can now dispose of the pending amendment, since there seems to be complete agreement on it, we shall go back to the other amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator from Wyoming referring now to the insertion of a new section 630?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall reserve a point of order and make it at the proper time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is subject to a point of order. If the point of order is raised, after an explanation of the amendment, I shall have only one recourse, namely, to move to suspend the rule. I am hopeful that the Senator from Illinois may find the explanation which is offered on behalf of the committee as being adequate for his purpose.

The purpose of the amendment is to enable the Department of Defense to carry on the greatly increased burdens of the Department in its efforts to handle the tremendous program of procurement for the three services which has been thrust upon the Department by the appropriations of 1951 and the new appropriations in this bill. The staff of the Department of Defense, to my certain knowledge, has been working long hours of overtime without additional compensation. The purpose is to add 15 temporary positions in the higher grades, so that the Secretary of Defense may have the assistance of highly qualified persons from civilian life who will add to the managerial competency of the Department. In order to make certain that these will not result in a permanent change in the law we have inserted the words "temporary positions," because the subject is presently under consideration by the appropriate legislative committee.

Deputy Secretary Lovett, then Acting Secretary of Defense, submitted a letter to the committee under date of August 28, which I shall be very glad to put into the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
*Chairman, Armed Services Subcommittee,  
Committee on Appropriations,  
United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: We at the Department of Defense are becoming increasingly aware of our need for outstanding personnel in the higher grades and do not feel that we can wait to get appointing authority for them until over-all revisions to the Classification Act, which have been discussed for a long time, may be enacted. Rather, we request that language be inserted in the 1952 appropriations act of the Department of Defense to permit the assignment to the Office of the Secretary of Defense of an additional 15 super grades, 8 in the grade of GS-18 and 7 in the grade of GS-17.

The Department feels that these permanent authorities should be authorized to us now, and is agreeable that they should be temporary insofar as their relationship to a later total is concerned, either being repealed whenever there is an over-all amendment to the Classification Act which may increase the authorized positions, or being subtracted from any allocation given to the Department of Defense by subsequent laws.

Within the Department of Defense, including the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, there are only 135 super grades including P-9 scientists. Of this total 103 have been allocated to the three military departments, with 32 allocated to the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Of those 32, 17 are temporary authorities under the Defense Production Act, and are concentrated in the Munitions Board on procurement positions,



and in the areas of manpower and personnel under Assistant Secretary Rosenberg. Another seven (including five P-9 scientists) are in the Research and Development Board.

As a result only eight positions (one GS-18, two GS-17's, and five GS-16's) are available for the varied responsibilities of our immediate Office and for all other agencies formally established as a part of the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The areas of responsibility which are suffering most from the lack of job authorities at the present time are concerned with top-level legal assistance in various fields, foreign military aid, fiscal, budget, procurement and contract matters, international relations, production financing, and various matters allied thereto.

Provided these positions are authorized, it is expected that no more than 40 percent of them will be filled by promotions from within, and that the balance of them will be filled by employment of skilled and qualified personnel from other agencies or from outside the Government. The types of responsibilities which it is contemplated these officials will have and the caliber of the people we hope to get are such that it is mandatory that these salary opportunities be available. Otherwise, not only will we not be able to fill the newly created positions but we will find increasing numbers of our own key people leaving us for more attractive offers from outside the Government, and for positions within the Government where the temporary agencies have more opportunities to offer them.

Without the proposed authorities we will be forced to fill these positions with less capable people, and also may find an increasing tendency on the part of our own key officials to look to the temporary agencies or to private business for salary opportunities which are denied them as employees of this permanent agency which has the primary responsibility in the field of national defense.

At the present time, although the Department of Defense is by far the largest of the operating defense agencies, it suffers a considerable comparative disadvantage in employment conditions in the top civilian managerial positions when considered in relationship to the temporary defense agencies. This disadvantage is one which seems to be increasing rather than leveling off as each new agency gets statutory authority for additional top-level jobs. A table summarizing the planned employment in various of the so-called other defense agencies is attached by way of illustration.

The Department of Defense proposal for the small number of additional GS-18 and GS-17 grades for the Office of the Secretary of Defense requested herein has been discussed with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who interposes no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration and action.

Enclosed is a proposed amendment to the general provisions of the Department of Defense fiscal year 1952 appropriation act which would give effect to this request.

If these positions are authorized, it is contemplated that they will be filled only on the personal approval of the Secretary or Deputy Secretary of Defense, and that their purpose will be to increase the top-level civilian managerial talent of the Department in the general areas discussed herein.

With kindest regards, I am,  
Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT,  
Acting Secretary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois will not raise the point of order. I give him the assurance of the whole committee that this subject, like the one just under discussion, will be carefully reviewed in

conference. I may say that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has been checking on this matter, and the Senator from Michigan likewise. We have a complete understanding among the three of us that in the present situation we ought to allow these temporary 15 positions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the first place, temporary positions have a rather intriguing way of becoming permanent positions. After they are set up as temporary positions they harden into permanent positions. I am frank to say that I do not know what a temporary position is. Normally one would think that it would be for the life of an appropriation, namely, 1 year, or at the outside for 2 years. But they are carried on and on and on, and finally they are made permanent, and the jobs are there to stay. These positions are for grades GS-17 and GS-18. If they are related to procurement functions, it seems to me the committee ought to write a date line into the amendment, so as to cut off the positions at the end of the year.

I certainly would not make the point of order if there were some assurance that at the end of a year's time these positions would lapse. However, from long experience I know what happens in connection with positions of this kind, and therefore I would feel constrained to make the point of order unless the bill carried more safeguarding language than it carries at the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, to the amendment I offer the following amendment: On page 69, at the end of line 18, after the word "positions", insert "for the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not make the point of order, on the basis of the amendatory language the Senator has just submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming to the committee amendment, on page 69 in line 18.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment previously passed over will be stated.

The next committee amendment passed over was, on page 71, in line 7, to insert:

SEC. 632. No funds appropriated in titles II, III, IV, and V of this act shall be used for the payment in excess of 530,000 full-time graded civilian employees at any one time during the current fiscal year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this committee amendment probably calls for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

We now have completed all the committee amendments which have previously been passed over; but there is a

matter which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] may wish to discuss, and I know there is a matter which the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] desires to discuss.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to call up the amendment identified as "9-10-51-I," which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for himself and the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is on page 57, in line 22, I believe.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it is on page 71, in line 9.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Michigan feel that there should be a quorum call before that matter is brought up? I wish to be perfectly fair to all Senators who have indicated an interest in the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is quite all right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will refer now to the amendment on page 57, in line 22, he will find that he and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have an amendment to it; and on behalf of the subcommittee, I shall be very glad to accept their amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not that amendment on page 58, in line 2? The printed amendment is identified as "9-10-51-J." The amendment would be inserted before the period in line 2, on page 58 of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Michigan is quite correct. That is a general proviso to be added at the end of that section.

Therefore, before the amendment is offered, I shall ask that the committee amendment on page 57 be agreed to. This amendment provides a limitation upon the payment of tuition for employees, by requiring the specific approval of the Secretary of the Department concerned before it can be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The other amendment is broader, and ought to be in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Wyoming wish to have a vote taken on the amendment at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, I ask that the amendment be acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 57, in lines 22 and 23, which has previously been stated.

Is there objection? Hearing none, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Wyoming accepted and the Senate adopted an amendment to the committee amendment on page 57, line 22. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately after the adoption of the amendment, a statement which I have prepared with reference to the subject involved.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD  
TUITION

This amendment deals with the abuse, particularly by the Air Force, of funds which were provided primarily for paying the tuition of scientific and technical personnel at higher institutions of learning (scientific and technical schools, MIT, etc.), where it is deemed to be necessary in order that this caliber of personnel may keep abreast of rapidly developing scientific and technical subjects.

The Air Force was found to be using these funds to pay not only the salaries but also the tuitions of totally unqualified people in business colleges where they were learning to be file clerks, typists, and stenographers.

Under the broad terms of the language in previous appropriation bills this was found to be not illegal, except in one respect. There is no civil-service job description to cover an employee whose sole activity for the Government is that of being a student.

A check at the Civil Service Commission will reveal this to be an accurate statement in its substance. And if it is indicated, I believe the Comptroller General will be fully justified in attempting to recover from responsible disbursing officers sums expended in a manner that was contemplated at the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The committee has recognized this situation, and attempted in a degree to cure it with committee amendment language to be found in lines 22 and 23 on page 57. The language simply provides wherever funds provided in this act are used to pay tuition approval of the Secretary of the department concerned is required.

This is all right so far as it goes; but it does not go far enough. The principal difficulty in personnel problems of the Defense Establishment have their roots in the fact that personnel administration is too greatly diffused and decentralized to allow effective restrictions from departmental levels at Washington.

This amendment in effect provides that no tuition may be paid out of any funds appropriated in this or prior Defense Establishment appropriation acts for persons in jobs which pay less than the rate for GS (Government service) 5.

The Civil Service Commission advises that no scientific or technical personnel in either junior or senior grades are paid below this level. In effect the amendment precludes the payment of tuition for file clerks, stenographers and typists who, generally speaking, are either paid below this grade or have reached a proficiency where additional education for this purpose is not required.

Thus, this amendment would provide for the refresher courses for technical and scientific personnel in a manner that was originally offered as justification for this general provision in appropriation bills. It was never intended to pay tuition in order to qualify people to take positions at the very bottom of the civil-service classification schedule where the requirements are at the very minimum.

NOTE.—This amendment is written to apply to funds available from appropriations contained in this act and funds available from prior appropriation acts for the Defense Establishment.

Its application to prior appropriation acts may be argued to be "legislative" and therefore subject to a point of order. If desired, this particular language may be deleted from the amendment. It was put in primarily because appropriations are being enacted for the Defense Establishment around the calendar and actually there is a great deal of money available to the Defense Establishment not provided for in this act.

NOTE.—This amendment is to the general provisions of the bill, but it is designed to override similar provisions in the appropriation language for the respective departments. With respect to the Air Force, it seems to make little sense to allow funds appropriated for maintenance and operation of the Air Force to be used to pay tuition for student typists at a business college.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I now call up the amendment identified as "9-10-51-J," which is submitted by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], on behalf of himself and myself. As I understand, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has just come to the floor. Let me say that the Senator from Michigan has just presented the amendment which the Senator from Virginia discussed yesterday with the chairman of the subcommittee. I am indicating, as I indicated to the Senator from Virginia, that I am very happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inform the Senator from Wyoming that the committee amendment in line 7, on page 71, has not yet been agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the amendment which I said should go over until we have a quorum call.

In the meantime, I wish to dispose of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and then I wish to permit the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to make the comment he wishes to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the clerk to state the amendment submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, before the period in line 2, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no appropriation contained in this act, and no funds available from prior appropriations to component departments and agencies of the Department of Defense, shall be used to pay tuition or to make other payments to educational institutions in connection with the instruction or training of employees receiving, or prospective employees who will receive, compensation at a rate below the minimum rate of pay for positions allocated to grade GS-5 under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will yield to me in a rather general way, there are some questions which I should like to address to him upon a subject which I have already discussed with him and with other Senators, with the staff of the committee, and with some of the

personnel of the Defense Department. So if the Senator from Wyoming will yield at this time for a rather general discussion, I shall appreciate his doing so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy, indeed, to yield to the Senator from Florida, and I am glad he is bringing up that matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, when I noted the exact wording of the report of the Appropriations Committee relative to this bill, and later when I noted in 12 places in the bill certain wording, not always alike, but always raising the same question which I shall mention, I discussed the matter with the Senator from Wyoming. I believe we were in accord that the best way to straighten out the matter would be to bring it to the floor, for some discussion.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is, of course, thoroughly familiar and has shown complete familiarity with a certain provision of the Constitution which has existed as a part of the Constitution from the very beginning of our country. I refer to the constitutional provision relative to appropriations for the Army. That provision is found in paragraph 12 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution; and it has been in the Constitution always, has never been changed, and has never been the subject matter of any decision by the Supreme Court, and therefore there is no chance to measure its meaning against any judicial interpretation.

The provision to which I refer comes in a section which has to do with the power of the Congress. It reads as follows:

The Congress shall have power—

And then, skipping down a little in the section, we come to this paragraph:

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

That provision did not find its way into the Constitution without a great deal of debate and discussion, and, as a matter of fact, somewhat similar propositions had been incorporated in the constitutions of several of the original States. They are referred to in the debates and also in the article in the *Federalist*, written by Alexander Hamilton, bearing upon this particular part of the Constitution.

As a predicate for what I expect to ask of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I should like to read a portion of two paragraphs from Mr. Hamilton's paper, as printed in the *Federalist*. He has previously discussed the provisions in State constitutions, and the fact that they were not highly effective, and he then continues:

Let us examine whether there be any comparison, in point of efficacy, between the provision alluded to, and that which is contained in the new constitution for restraining the appropriations of money for military purposes to the period of 2 years. The former—

He means, of course, the provisions contained in the State constitutions—by aiming at too much, is calculated to effect nothing: the latter, by steering clear



of an imprudent extreme, and by being perfectly compatible with a proper provision for the exigencies of the Nation, will have a salutary and powerful operation.

The Legislature of the United States will be obliged, by this provision, once at least in every 2 years, to deliberate upon the propriety of keeping a military force on foot; to come to a new resolution on the point; and to declare their sense of the matter, by a formal vote in the face of their constituents. They are not at liberty to vest in the executive department permanent funds for the support of an army, if they were even incautious enough to be willing to repose in it so improper a confidence.

There is more in the paper by Mr. Hamilton which bears upon this subject, but I think I have quoted the most important portions of the paper.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Referring, for instance, to page 19, line 17, do I correctly understand that the Senator is objecting to the words "and thereafter, for the purposes authorized in this paragraph"? The whole sentence would read:

For expenditures during fiscal year 1952 and thereafter, and \$30,000,000 for expenditures during fiscal 1953.

If a semicolon is placed after the numeral "1953" and the words eliminated "and thereafter, for the purposes authorized in this paragraph", does the Senator believe that would be constitutional?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe so, however, I think—

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will yield further, the Senator from Michigan had intended to raise the same question. I agree that this appears to be an appropriation for a longer period of time than 2 years, and, therefore, to be unconstitutional.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comment of the distinguished Senator. In order that the point may be fully made, however, for the record—because I apprehend that this exchange may have more than a temporary meaning—I should like to continue my point. I find that in the years which are in the past, this question has come up several times, and there have been two opinions rendered by former Attorneys General of the United States. I have read both of those opinions. I shall not discuss them at length at this time, unless there be Members of the Senate who are desirous of my doing so.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has raised a most interesting question, and I should be interested in knowing, on the basis of the Senator's study of the opinions of the Attorneys General and his reading of the Federalist papers, whether any technical distinction was made in the minds of the founding fathers between the Army and the Navy. Of course, the language of the Constitution refers only to the

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, such a distinction was made. The Senator may refer also to a matter which has been the basis for distinction in the two opinions rendered by two former Attorneys General of the United States. In both of those opinions a distinction has been made which I think is artificial, to say the least, between those appropriations which are made for the salary of military personnel and for their clothing and subsistence, which those opinions say are covered by the provision of the Constitution, and the appropriation for the manufacture of guns or military supplies or the supplying of ordnance or of ammunition, or of all the things, in short, which make an army a military force. Without the existence of those military things, of course, a group of persons banded together as an army would be nothing more than a group of persons; and the position of the Attorneys General to the effect that there is a difference between those two classes of expenditure is, I think, most artificial.

However, I may say to the distinguished Senator that the inadequacy of the opinions of the Attorneys General goes even further than would be indicated by that unrealistic distinction, because the principal case in which the matter arose was not a question of the propriety of making an appropriation for more than 2 years; it was a question of whether an authorization of an expenditure which it would take more than 2 years to carry out—the authorization, for instance, of a contract to build a ship which it would take more than 2 years to build—would be legal. That, as the Senator will realize, is a completely different question from the question of outright appropriations in money, because an authorization of a contract for the expenditure of funds is something which can be stopped at any time by the Congress, in its judgment, and which will at most call for simply the payment of a penalty or of damages of some kind or other; but it would still leave it to the discretion of the Congress as to whether a contract authorized and under way should be continued to its completion or should be halted in the stage in which it was found at the time. The Senator will recall that not only the Congress has this right of stopping contracts, but also the executive department itself. In a recent instance, the late Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, stopped the construction of a very large carrier which was being constructed at Newport News, when the work had not gone far, requiring, of course, the payment of large sums of liquidated damages, or of determined damages, but not permitting the completion of the contract. It is an illustration of the fact that contractual authorization goes far short of the actual appropriation of money. So I want to say for the RECORD that it seems to me that the decision of the Attorney General in the original case, which was simply referred to and affirmed in the second case, goes far short of meeting the question presented in this bill, because it had to do with contractual authorization rather than with actual ap-

propriations over a period of more than 2 years.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Florida. I agree with him that the issue which is presented by this question insofar as it involves the appropriation of cash instead of the use of contract authority, and making it available for more than two fiscal years, certainly raises a different question from any we have had presented in prior instances.

Historically, I believe that the position taken by the Attorney General, to which allusion has been made, is the rule which has been followed. For instance, I recall raising the question in connection with appropriations in the House, where I was told that there is a difference between appropriations for pay and appropriations for procurement; that appropriation for pay of the Army and appropriations for subsistence, and appropriations for clothing and equipment, were probably covered by the constitutional limitation, but that appropriations for ordnance or appropriations for construction were not. I think the House has historically proceeded upon that basis.

However, we have another interesting angle here, which is that the Air Force originally was the Army Air Corps, at the time that the Air Force was a part of the Army. In the sense of being the Army Air Corps, it was understood that the appropriations for air were under the same limitations as the appropriations for the Army. Now, however, with a Department of the Air Force, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Army, so far as I can see, the situation which the Navy has heretofore enjoyed is now being cared for by the Air Force, in the very limited fields of pay, subsistence, clothing, and equipment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator. I noted in some of the hearing records and some of the reports that he had raised this specific question when he was a distinguished Member of the House, and I noted that the point was made, pursuant to his question, that there was this difference between procurement and pay, subsistence, clothing, and the like, to which he has referred. However, the practice has not gone so far, at all, as to depart from the constitutional method of handling it, by reason of this fact. There seems to have been a very careful survey of each appropriation bill, at least in the recent past—I have gone over the last two very carefully, and I am told by the staff that it has been going on for some time—to see what unexpended balances there were at the end of each 2-year period, and then to have those unexpended balances re-appropriated in the current bill so as to carry them forward and bring them outside the prohibition of the Constitution. I believe the Senator will find that that practice has prevailed very meticulously, insofar as the Senator from Florida has been able to go into the question in the little time he has had available.

Mr. CASE. I think the Senator's observation is well founded. I think it has had the salutary effect, which was sought by the founders of the Constitution, of assuring that vast sums of unobligated balances were not continued indefinitely and applied, perhaps, to purposes far different from those originally in mind when the appropriation was first made.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I want to say that the Senator from Wyoming, in his able work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the armed services, has meticulously observed the matter of carrying forward balances, not only in the bill but in the report. The distinguished Senator has very carefully brought it to the attention of the Congress that there are very large unexpended balances, amounting, I believe, to some \$44,000,000,000—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Amounting to \$39,000,000,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. He calls attention to that fact, and, so far as the Senator from Wyoming is concerned, he has been meticulous in his adherence to that precedent which apparently has been maintained consciously by the Senator and his committee, as well as by preceding committees in this field. I commend him and them for doing that. There is certainly no thought on the part of the Senator from Florida of suggesting that there are any hidden items here, nor is there any thought that anyone is trying to evade the Constitution. The only thought that the Senator from Florida has in connection with the matter is that if this new formula were used such use would be of highly questionable constitutionality and could easily be made the basis for later procedure entirely different from that which has been followed heretofore, and for that reason he feels it should not be used even this once. It may well become mischievous on some occasions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am grateful to the Senator from Florida for his generous remarks with reference to the chairman of the subcommittee. I desire to point out, however, that in addition to what the Senator has said about the desirability of making certain that excessive appropriations are not to be built up, the Committee on Appropriations, at the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee, has authorized me to address a letter to the Department of Defense requesting a complete report upon all outstanding contract authority so that we may know what contract authority has been liquidated and thereby used, and what contract authority has not been used.

With respect to the 12 items to which the Senator has alluded, let me say that they deal in every instance with procurement of long-life items, the sort of items which the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Hoyt, in 1904, had in mind when the distinguished and able constitutional lawyer, Philander C. Knox, was Secretary of War, and when the opinion of the Attorney General was

rendered to the effect that long-life items did not explicitly come within the meaning of the constitutional provision. I think that perhaps there may have been a little rationalization in that opinion. We are now, however, making available such huge sums of money that greater care than ever is necessary to be exercised.

I feel that the bill should go from the Chamber in such form that it will be perfectly clear that we want to stay within the Constitution. I am hoping that if divine providence can stay the drift of the world into a third world war, in another year or two it may be possible to rescind some of these appropriations.

I wish to point out that the contracts which are let for the various procurement items contain provisions for the termination of the contracts when the procurement items are no longer needed. So that I feel that the amendment which the Senator from Florida and I have discussed, and which was just mentioned by the Senator from Michigan, to delete the words "and thereafter", after the figure "1953", should be adopted in each of these cases.

When the Senator from Florida has completed his statement, if he desires to make a motion to that effect, I shall be very happy indeed to accept it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I warmly thank the Senator.

In the first place, I may say that it seems to me that certain questions and answers in the RECORD might make it very clear that the intent is to stay strictly within the constitutional provision. Therefore, may I ask this question of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming: Notwithstanding the wording of the report and the wording of the bill, was it the intention of the subcommittee which he heads that the whole of the appropriation made as a 1952 fiscal-year appropriation was for commitment and obligation in fiscal 1952?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but it was recognized that because of the length of time necessary to build and construct certain of the items, a certain portion of the funds could not possibly be expended during the fiscal year 1952, particularly since we are now in the third month of that year.

Mr. HOLLAND. As a second question, may I ask the Senator this: Is it not correct that the desire of the Senator to break down the expenditures into two groups, one, of some \$37,000,000,000-plus, to be expended in fiscal year 1952, and a second, of some \$23,000,000,000-plus, to be expended in 1953, was primarily for the purpose of advising the country clearly that the appropriation, huge as it was, could not possibly be expended in 1 year and could not possibly bring about the economic difficulties which would be created by the expenditure of such a huge sum in this field in 1 year, but, instead, would be divided between the 2 years substantially in the amounts which I have stated and which are stated in the report as well as in the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not only that, but also that the annual revenues of the Government for the fiscal year 1952 would not be called upon to bear the burdens of expenditures which cannot be made until 1953. So, while we are making an appropriation for expenditures in 2 years, we also have revenues which will accumulate in the Treasury during the same 2 years; and the burden of this huge appropriation bill is not all cast upon the revenues of 1952.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that I thoroughly approve the logic behind both reasons for the stating of these two amounts, and I gladly join as to the desirability of that method of approach.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to hear it stated that it is proposed to offer an amendment to strike out the words "and thereafter," for I point out that that solves a very great difficulty the conferees would have. Under the rule of the House of Representatives the words "and thereafter" would constitute legislation, and would not be in order on an appropriation bill. Under the rule of the House the words "and thereafter" would be regarded as being beyond the jurisdiction of the appropriate committees of the Congress to report. Consequently it would constitute legislation which the conferees would have to secure acceptance of by the House. Under the technical rule of the House, insertion of the words "and thereafter" would make it necessary that each one of these amendments be taken back to the House for a separate vote, and it would not be possible to obtain any agreement in conference were the technical point to be raised.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for that excellent contribution.

My third question to be addressed to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is this. Having in mind that some of the expenditure covered by this appropriation might not even be completed at the end of the second year, would it not meet the purpose which the Senator has in mind just as well to delete the words "and thereafter", looking forward to the renewal or continuance of any unexpended balance in the appropriation bill for the year 1954 at the proper time to take the place of those words and the implications gained from them now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I understand the Senator's question clearly—my attention was diverted for a moment—I think the elimination of the words "and thereafter" after "1953" would accomplish what we all have in mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to restate the question, since the Senator's attention was drawn elsewhere. My question was whether the purposes which he has in mind would be well safeguarded and could be thoroughly carried out even though the words "and thereafter," which are the objection-



able words here, were eliminated, by pursuing the practice which has heretofore prevailed, and which I believe has prevailed up to this year in the Congress, of reappropriating unexpended balances, if any there be, of this appropriation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the drafting of the annual appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be my thought that the legislative record which we are making here now should be that any unexpended balances at the end of fiscal 1953 would have to be reappropriated by the Congress. I feel that that would be a very excellent precedent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not desire to prolong this discussion, because I entirely agree with the Senator from Wyoming in accepting the amendment. But for the RECORD I should like to point out—I think I am right, but I am not certain—that in, we will say, this appropriation for 1953, if the money is obligated by June 30 of 1953, it can be carried over and expended in 1954 and 1955. In other words, any appropriation obligated before the end of any fiscal year can be held good for 2 years thereafter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would want to make the record clear that by this discussion it is the intention of the Senate, in accepting this amendment, that there should be action on a future appropriation bill to make such unexpended balances available for expenditure.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think I am in accord with both of the Senators in general, but I do call attention to the fact, and I ask that the Senator from Massachusetts follow this item, that while a portion of this appropriation is to be expended under the terms of the bill in fiscal 1953, this is, as a whole, an appropriation for fiscal 1952, and it so becomes under the terms of section 1 of the bill. As the Senator from Wyoming has already stated, which I understand is a fact, this whole amount, whether to be expended this year or next, is a subject to be committed, and is intended to be committed in this fiscal year 1952, and that, therefore, for that one good reason, the law which applies to customary appropriations might not necessarily apply to that portion of the expenditures to be made in next year, 1953.

Further, I should like to say that while there is a general statute permitting expenditure during the next 2 years of sums committed—at least as the Senator from Florida understands it—out of the appropriation for a given fiscal year, there is no assurance whatsoever that that provision would apply in the case of military appropriations if the point should be made, because the provision of the Constitution rather bluntly would apply to the case and would prevent the

use in the second of those two additional years if such an interpretation were followed. So I strongly hope that the position taken by the Senator from Wyoming will be accepted, and that the practice which has prevailed heretofore will continue, of renewing and reenacting unexpended portions of appropriations before the time runs on them, before the two constitutional years of time runs on them, so that no question may arise in this field.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree entirely with the Senator from Florida that the more supervision the Congress keeps over the funds, the better. If we reappropriate unexpended funds, it means we have got to look them over, and that is a good thing to do.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his observation.

The purpose of the Senator from Florida in rising and calling attention to the constitutional provision is very clear. It is to require the Congress itself to assume responsibility of renewing appropriations which are unexpended. By the recurring debate of the matter here upon the floor, people throughout the land will be advised that there may not be continuing appropriations, and that no funds will remain available beyond 2 years after the date of an appropriation in this field of military expenditures. Under the thinking of the framers of the Constitution, which I fully share, the soundest way to keep our country one in which the civilian agencies of Government will always control the military is by refusing to turn over the money keys for too long a period of time.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. Do I understand the Senator's amendment is in line 17, to strike out the words "and thereafter"?

Mr. HOLLAND. We have not gotten to the actual amendments, and there may be some difficulties in connection with that, because I believe all these amendments—there are 12 of them—are to committee amendments which have been adopted, and which may have to be reconsidered in order that amendments to them may be taken up.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; there is an understanding—it was entered into last night—that all these items could be reviewed today. The purpose, of course, being to enable the Senator to bring up his very valuable discussion.

If the Senator from Rhode Island will look at page 24 of the bill, he will find one of the items. In line 16, after the figures "1953" the proposal would be to strike out the words "and thereafter."

Mr. GREEN. Should it not be done in both places?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; not in both places, I think.

Mr. GREEN. Why not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because I think the legislative history we are making

here is quite clear, that that is merely intended to allow the expenditure of balances of that fund during 1953.

Mr. GREEN. In one place it says "1952 and thereafter", and in another place it says "1953 and thereafter."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would amend the amendment of the Senator from Florida by inserting after the word "thereafter" where that word follows the figures 52, the words "in 1953."

Mr. GREEN. That is my point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That would overcome the objection which the Senator from Rhode Island raises.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I accept the modification of my amendment in each case, but I want to call attention to one further point in connection with the very matter which the Senator from Rhode Island has brought up. I invite the attention of the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] to the fact that, with respect to some of these items, there may be other words which call for a legislative interpretation and understanding. I particularly refer to the words "to remain available until expended," to be found in lines 22 and 23 on page 40. There are several of the 12 instances in which that formula also appears in the appropriation. The Senator from Florida, believing that the Senator from Wyoming means those words to be interpreted in consonance with the constitutional provision, wishes to address this question to the Senator from Wyoming:

Wherever the words "to remain available until expended" are found in this military appropriation bill, is it the understanding and intent of the Senator from Wyoming that those words should call for an expenditure within the 2 years provided in the Constitution, and would not be efficacious beyond that time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On this point I think attention should be called to the fact that the amendment which the Senator is now reading apparently applies to the Navy and not to the Army. The constitutional provision which the Senator has read refers specifically to armies and not to navies. It was because of that distinction that the Department of Justice, on January 2, 1904, as I understand, made the distinction—no; I am wrong about that. As I glance through the opinion, I see that it had to do with the Secretary of War, and with the expenditure of a sum for contract authority, I believe.

However, the same theory was adopted in 1948, in connection with an inquiry directed to the Attorney General by the Secretary of the Air Force. The opinion of the Attorney General at that time, dated January 8, 1948, had to do with the correctness or incorrectness of the advice of the counsel of the Department of the Air Force, that—

There appears to be no legal objection to a request to the Congress to appropriate funds to the Air Force for the procurement of aircraft and aeronautical equipment, to remain available until expended.

Of course the words "to remain available until expended" in this use, so far as the Air Force is concerned, and so far as the Navy is concerned, carry over beyond the 2-year period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me make this comment, because I think the Record should show it: The Senator from Wyoming is entirely correct in his statement that the constitutional provisions covering the authority to raise armies and the authority to maintain a navy are different. They are found in succeeding paragraphs in section 8 of Article I. The one which we have been discussing is paragraph 12, and the one following, paragraph 13, reads as follows:

To provide and maintain a navy.

There is no time limitation in that paragraph with respect to providing and maintaining a navy.

However, as to the Air Force, I am not at all sure that the provision applicable to the Army would not be the one applicable to it, because it was carved out of the Army, and because it is quite evident from the paper of Mr. Hamilton from which I have already quoted that he thought of the measure as affecting all military purposes, because those are the words which he uses in his discussion of the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator from Florida, but I think it is important in the discussion here that we should always bear in mind that the defense of the United States, in this era of tremendous scientific advance, is our paramount purpose. We want to be careful, however, that we shall not be building up huge carry-over items which could be used for improper purposes. We ought to have a system which will guarantee continuous scrutiny by Congress of these expenditures. With that philosophy I completely agree. If in the consideration of these amendments when they go to conference it may seem necessary to add some additional language to make this general purpose clear, and at the same time to protect the national security, I am sure that the Senator from Florida would desire to see that the conferees did that very thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his patience.

In closing, I simply wish to say that I am completely in accord with his position that this point need be given no consideration whatever in connection with the Navy appropriation. As to the Air Force appropriation, certainly it would be the part of wisdom to regard it just as carefully as we do the Army appropriation, because it was created out of the Army. For a long time it received its appropriation as a part of the Army appropriations.

At this time, with the consent of the Senator from Wyoming, I should like to ask that the 12 amendments be considered en bloc, and adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With the exception of the Navy amendments? Did the Senator mean to indicate that? Some

of these items represent procurement for the Navy. For example, there is an aircraft carrier, which cannot possibly be built within the time mentioned.

Mr. HOLLAND. I make my modified amendments apply, then, to 10 instead of 12 committee amendments, or to apply to whatever the proper number is after eliminating from consideration in this connection the appropriations for the Navy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have made it clear to the Senator that in the conference we shall go carefully into the whole subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the candor of the Senator. I am sure that the matter will be in good hands when he handles it in conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming accept the amendments offered by the Senator from Florida?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I accept the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the modified amendments to the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments to committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 6, line 8, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 19, line 16, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 17, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 22, line 1, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 2, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 24, line 15, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 16, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 25, line 20, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 21 and 22, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 27, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 28, line 4, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 47, line 10, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 11, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 48, line 1, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "and thereafter."

On page 52, line 13, after the word "thereafter", insert "during 1953"; and in line 14, strike out the words "and thereafter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments, as amended, are agreed to en bloc.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. ALBERT C. VAUGHN, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. FRANK FELLOWS, late a Representative from the State of Maine, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think we have now completed the committee amendments, with the exception of the amendment on page 71, beginning in line 7. I believe the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has an amendment which he wishes to offer.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on behalf of myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader I respectfully call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the fact that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] also wishes to offer an amendment to line 9 of that paragraph.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On what page?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Page 71, line 9. I shall send for the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, after the word "employees", in line 9, it is proposed to insert "(including (a) the full-time equivalent of part-time employment, (b) persons who are described as 'consultants' or who are compensated on a 'when actually employed' basis if such persons are employed on a contract basis or are paid on a per diem basis, and (c) persons employed without compensation if they are reimbursed for expenses)."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the committee amendment in section 632 establishes a ceiling of 530,000 full-time graded civilian employees.

The committee amendment is wide open with respect to "part-time equivalents of full-time employees," persons employed as "consultants" on a contract basis, persons employed on a per diem basis when actually working, and persons described as employed "without compensation," but who are paid lavishly for their expenses.



This amendment merely provides that for ceiling purposes these persons should be counted within the 530,000 ceiling.

It should be noted that as in the case of the committee amendment this amendment applies only to graded civilian employees, and does not affect wage board employees, such as those engaged in construction and other industrial work with such defense establishments as navy yards, arsenals, and so forth.

Like the committee, it makes no reference to "temporary employees" who may be required to meet emergencies.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have we completed action on section 632, on page 71?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Action has not been completed on it. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 633. No part of any appropriation made by this act for any purpose shall be used for the payment of the compensation of graded employees in excess of an amount equal to 90 percent of the amount requested for the compensation of such employees in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for payment of the compensation of such employees, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purposes. Nothing in this section shall be construed as reducing any amount available for payment of the compensation of such employees below an amount equal to 90 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inform the Senator from Illinois that his Senator's amendment proposes to insert a new section, and does not pertain to section 632.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is apparent. Therefore the amendment on page 71, as amended, can now be adopted without at all interfering with the present consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 71, line 9, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Illinois whether his amendment has been printed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it has not been printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to explain his amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, and I shall not labor the matter for any length of time. By the committee amendment, a ceiling of 530,000 is fixed for graded positions. As amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], it would include consultants, and part-time positions.

The amendment which I have offered would place a limit of 90 percent on the estimated positions. As I understand, the budget figures, when first submitted, showed that there would be an estimated number of 546,000 graded civilian positions in the Military Establishment. Of course, as of June 30, 1951, they had not reached that total.

I believe the budget figures indicate that they had 439,991 positions as of that date. In other words, they had roughly 105,000 positions to go to reach the budget estimate of June 30, 1952. If we cut down the estimated number in the budget 10 percent, it would take off roughly 54,600, and give a ceiling of 491,000 positions. It would be an increase of 51,000 over the figure that obtained on June 30, and it would be a decrease of roughly 56,000 positions.

I am not unmindful of the fact that one can argue well on both sides of the question. In the first place, we have an expanding military program. I suppose it is fair to assume that extra positions will be added. On the other hand, in going around the country and making observations in one place and another, I concur in the observation made earlier in the spring on a number of military policy bills, that there is still a substantial waste of civilian manpower.

I know of no way of dealing with it except to shrink the ceiling. The amendment would cut it by 10 percent, so that the ceiling would be about 491,000, instead of 530,000, as carried in the bill. That is the whole story of the amendment in a nutshell.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would agree completely with what the Senator from Illinois says if it were not for one overriding fact, and that is that the committee has inserted in the bill, and the Senate has already adopted, a provision which was not budgeted, to expand the air power of the United States. We have put in the national emergency fund, which has had the approval of the Senate, a provision to procure additional aircraft and additional air personnel, so that the United States of America and all of its people may know—and that, more important than that, that the Soviet dictators and their satellites may know—that the United States of America is building an air power that will be capable of delivering, in case of necessity, to the very heart of Communist aggression the weapons which research and development are making available to us.

It was for that reason that the committee in reviewing this matter, instead of adopting a ceiling of 500,000, which was proposed by the Senator from Mich-

igan [Mr. FERGUSON], adopted a ceiling of 530,000.

I readily give the assurance to the Senator from Illinois that it will be the purpose of the Appropriations Committee carefully to police all of these positions. The committee intends to proceed with that work. The additional personnel allowed by the amendment just adopted was for the purpose of enabling air power to be expanded.

Therefore, in those circumstances it is obvious, when the Senator offers an amendment which says that the ceiling shall be 90 percent of what the Budget Bureau estimated, inasmuch as the Budget Bureau never estimated anything for the additional appropriation which we have made for air power, we would by that very act impede the capacity of the Navy and the Air Force to expand as Congress wants them to expand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite in agreement with the argument, and I am certainly in full concurrence with the necessity of serving notice on Marshal Stalin that we mean business and that we intend to build up the air power of this country. I am equally interested in serving notice to him that this is going to be an efficient operation.

I regret to say that I entertain some doubts. I believe the weakness of the committee's position and the weakness of the position of the Bureau of the Budget, with which I have had a good many dealings over a long period of years, is simply this: I could never find that they had had adequate staffing to go into the field and there make a survey and adequate exploration as to what the needs were. Normally their explorations and surveys consist of having departmental budget officers lay the case before them. They cut a little here, cut a little there, augment a little here, and finally come up with the ultimate figure.

The other point is that the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee are not staffed for constant surveillance of the agencies of government in Washington and in the field, to ascertain what an adequate personnel complement really is. I think a large element of guesswork is involved.

The only way I can come to a conclusion regarding the matter is to keep my eyes open and to observe as I go from one place in the country to another. As I do so, I see a considerable waste of manpower in many places where the Government has headquarters establishments and military establishments of one kind or another. I am firmly of the opinion that there is overstaffing, and that a 90-percent directive would make it possible to carry on the expanded program in the building up of our air power. That is the reason for the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that no one desires more than do the members of the committee which reported this bill to see that overstaffing is cut down, and no one desires more than does the

chairman of the subcommittee to eliminate waste and extravagance and overstaffing in every branch of the military service. I have no doubt that there are such cases; but, as I have said before and as I announced at the meeting of the full committee, it will be our purpose as a committee to summon the responsible officials of each of the military departments before us and make them go into this matter in detail.

We have already been doing that. For instance, I now hold in my hand a letter which I received from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Anna M. Rosenberg. I read a portion of the letter:

I am enclosing a copy of a Department of Defense directive, which I know will be of interest to you. This directive is in line with our increased activities for more effective utilization of military and civilian personnel, and incorporates the following major features:

1. Establishes a ceiling for all military and civilian personnel in departmental activities in the Washington area at the strengths actually on board on July 20, 1951. Included are the departmental activities of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as well as those in the various boards and activities supporting the Secretary of Defense.

2. Within the next 90 days, each military department and the agencies of the Office of the Secretary of Defense must achieve a 5-percent reduction in both military and civilian strengths within the departmental activities referred to above. These reductions will be accomplished through normal attrition or turn-over, insofar as practicable, rather than through arbitrary reductions in force.

3. Military personnel will not be used to replace civilian personnel, nor shall we permit the intent of this directive to be circumvented by the expanded use of temporary duty, detail of individuals from field activities (either within or outside of the Washington area), or by any similar actions.

Mr. President, I shall not read the entire letter, but I now ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,  
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1951.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I am enclosing a copy of a Department of Defense directive, which I know will be of interest to you. This directive is in line with our increased activities for more effective utilization of military and civilian personnel, and incorporates the following major features:

1. Establishes a ceiling for all military and civilian personnel in departmental activities in the Washington area at the strengths actually on board on July 20, 1951. Included are the departmental activities of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as well as those in the various boards and activities supporting the Secretary of Defense.

2. Within the next 90 days, each military department and the agencies of the Office of the Secretary of Defense must achieve a 5-percent reduction in both military and civilian strengths within the departmental activities referred to above. These reductions will be accomplished through normal attrition or turn-over, insofar as practicable, rather than through arbitrary reductions in force.

3. Military personnel will not be used to replace civilian personnel, nor shall we permit the intent of this directive to be circumvented by the expanded use of temporary duty, detail of individuals from field activities (either within or outside of the Washington area), or by any similar actions.

In order to insure that any civilian personnel reductions be implemented in an honest and efficient manner, I should like to point out that the Secretaries of the military departments have been specifically charged with the responsibility of surveying their activities and effecting this reduction by selected activity, rather than across the board, and in a manner calculated to cause the minimum interference with essential activities. I have personally discussed this aspect with the Secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff, and emphasized the necessity for making this cut in those activities where cuts would be least disruptive.

I wish to point out that the above step is, in my judgment, only the most recent evidence of the Department's sincere desire and continuing efforts to effect economy in the use of personnel. The savings in our end fiscal year 1951 civilian employment brought about by the establishment of manpower ceilings within the budgetary ceilings are an example of these efforts.

Striking evidence is also available respecting economy in the use of military personnel. Through improved utilization, the Army expects to obtain two or three more divisions than were originally planned without increasing its requested end fiscal year 1952 strength of 1,552,000.

I believe that these savings illustrate the Department's adherence to the principle that budgetary ceilings should not be thought of as floors, and that they should be treated as a limit, not a goal.

We will continue to exert every effort to achieve maximum economy in the use of all Defense Department personnel, and we will appreciate your continuing interest and cooperation toward that end.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit that this letter, which has come to me over the signature of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, and which was printed in the record of our committee, and was sustained by the interrogations which we directed to the author of the letter and by the interrogations which were submitted to all of the responsible officials of the Department of Defense, is sufficient to indicate an eminently good-faith attempt by the Department of Defense to avoid all unnecessary use of manpower, either civilian or military.

My deep feeling upon the matter is that the imposition of an inflexible 10-percent cut at a time while we are expanding the military effort would be wholly unwise.

I hope I am sufficiently persuasive to induce the eminent, able, and distinguished Senator from Illinois to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this time, let me make several observations which I think are directly responsive to the statement made by the able Senator from Wyoming.

In the first place, the Senator from Wyoming has read from a letter which comes from the very agency of Government which is going to spend the money. Frankly, I do not accept those figures without some little doubt, unless they

can be verified in a wholly impartial fashion.

In the second place, it does not appear that the Senate Appropriations Committee has an adequate staff or a field staff which can adequately handle this matter; and the only things the committee presents to us are the result of cross-examinations in the committee. Over the years I have observed that such examinations are much like attempts in the course of a law suit to obtain information from witnesses, in that one obtains only the amount of information which the witnesses are willing to divulge.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the letter to which I have referred a specific 5-percent cut is directed, and it is being carried out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In my judgment, it is not adequate.

First, Mr. President, the spenders come before our committee and submit their figures. However, I think we are entitled to take the figures with a grain of salt until they are verified.

In the second place, the proposed \$5,000,000,000 expansion of the Air Corps calls for a ceiling on expenditures only for the year 1952, and the remainder in 1953, insofar as procurement is concerned. If that be true, and I think it is borne out by the figures carried in the bill, it certainly detracts from the case made by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, the House has established no ceiling. I see no reason why the Senate conferees cannot take the amendment to conference and there go into the matter with the conferees on the part of the House, and finally determine what should be done.

I renew my observation that there is no staff of ours which has gone through the personnel figures, which are just so much guesswork unless they are verified. I think that anyone who has observed in various places in the United States the various military installations of one kind or another cannot help but come to the conclusion that they are overstaffed.

Finally, Mr. President, every Member of Congress has, after all, some concern for those who are in uniform, men of good will, men of ability, men of integrity, who are interested in the solvency of the country and who constantly emphasize and bear down on the fact that there is a waste of civilian manpower in the military establishment at the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a comment at this point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One of the things of which I am most proud in connection with the presentation of this bill is the fact that the amendments adopted by the committee represent, with one or two rare exceptions, the unanimous decision of the committee. As chairman of the subcommittee, my desire throughout the consideration of this bill, as has been amply testified to here by members of the subcommittee, was to obtain a consensus of the opinion of the members



of the committee and to submit to the Senate a report which represented so far as possible the unanimous view of the committee. There never was a time when we acted at all according to party lines; there was no partisan division at all. We were concerned with only one thing, namely, to report a bill which would enable the Department of Defense to provide effectively and efficiently for the defense of our country.

I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois—and I beg him to believe what I say—that the Under Secretary of Defense, who now has been nominated to take the place of General Marshall, Mr. Robert Lovett, throughout the consideration of the budget left no stone unturned to eliminate unnecessary appropriations.

Mr. Wilfred J. McNeil, the various departmental secretaries, the entire staff of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and members of the departmental staff, were all cooperating with the committee in its effort to reduce appropriations. If the Senator has observed what has been said here, he will know that, even when the Department asked for restorations, the committee never went along with the full amount of restoration requested, except, perhaps, in one instance which comes to my mind. There has been a studious and intensive effort to keep personnel down, and to save dollars. The committee is not dropping the matter now, but will proceed.

I am not at all sure, I may say to the Senator, that a large additional staff would be helpful and efficient. I think that the most effective thing we can do is to bring the responsible officials before a committee of the Congress and make sure that they leave the committee room knowing that we expect them to take action along the line desired by the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, anyone who is familiar with the armed services of this country knows that one way for a ranking officer to get a promotion for himself is to take on more and more personnel, so that he can establish to the satisfaction of his superiors that he is discharging a greater responsibility. That is what is happening, and it has been for some time. They hand in their figures, and those are the figures which are finally compounded in the form of the military, naval, and air estimates which are submitted to the committees on appropriations. I know what the formula is. I have heard it and I have been confronted with it a thousand times. The question begins, "How many graded positions do you have? What was the budget estimate? How many do you need? What do you want them for? How are they disposed, and how are they assigned?" Senators take the word of the people who make the requests, who ask for the money, and who ask for the positions.

Over the years, it has been my duty and my responsibility to help cut down the Federal payroll, and it could be done only in proportion as we sent representatives into the departments to develop

some familiarity with the operation and find out where the waste and extravagance and overstaffing in manpower really existed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, a moment ago he remarked that he knew from experience how the committees handled the requests of departments, and he said, "Senators take the word of the agency which is going to expend the money." I assure the Senator that that statement does not apply to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, because we did not take the word of those who were to spend the money, and did not take the estimates which they made with respect to graded employees' restorations. On numerous occasions we gave only part of what was requested, and in some cases we allowed none of the increases. We made it clear to all three of the departments of defense that it was our purpose to cut this budget to the limit, and also that we were not going to wrap up the book and put it on the shelf the minute this appropriation bill was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the answer to that is simply this: If they ask for 50 percent more than they need, and the committee gives them 25 percent under their request, they still receive 25 percent more than their requirements.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But let me say that the doors of the committee were open, and Senators who wished to offer amendments or to interrogate any witness, or to bring forward witnesses, were welcome to do so. I asked every personnel officer who appeared before the committee whether his job or his salary was dependent upon the number of people under his employ. I went into that whole feature.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the Senator, is it not true that the senior Senator from Michigan actually made a proposal in the committee to set a ceiling of 500,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I just said so; and I explained to the Senator that the reason why we did not do it was because of the 7,400 restorations we made, and because of the conviction of the committee that the expansion of air power would make it impracticable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not wedded to any approach in the matter, Mr. President. I can modify the amendment so as to make it 491,000, which would have the effect of a 10-percent cut; or I would even be generous in the matter and make it 500,000, if that would satisfy the Senator from Wyoming; or I would leave it on a 10-percent basis. But I must persist, Mr. President, in the viewpoint I express, because it is a matter of deep conviction with the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FERGUSON rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator from Illinois is very sincere in his views on this subject. I was about to ask the Senator from Michigan what his view would be about the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan would like to have the Senator from Wyoming accept the figure of 500,000, and take the amendment to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Illinois will modify his amendment so as to make the figure 500,000, I shall then be very happy, upon the advice of the senior Senator from Michigan, to accept the amendment and to have it studied.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pending amendment, and to submit a new amendment, on page 71, line 9, to strike out the figures "530,000" and to insert "500,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wyoming whether he will accept that amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under the great persuasive capacity of the Senator from Michigan, I yield much against my judgment.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan had proposed, on all the other bills, a 10-percent cut. He figured we were getting nearly the 10-percent cut in the 530,000. But it would be within the realm of the 10-percent cut to make it 500,000; and I ask that that be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has already approved section 632, but, without objection, the Senate will reconsider the vote by which section 632 was agreed to, and change the figure in the amendment, as amended, to 500,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Chair stated that, without objection, the Senate would reconsider the vote by which section 632 was agreed to. I merely wanted to be very careful, having in mind future amendments. In the case of an amendment, the other day, there was no question of reconsideration. The bill was open to amendment. The question might arise again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Massachusetts is under a misapprehension. This amendment was open, but it was concluded today. Therefore the statement of the Chair is the proper parliamentary statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I call up an amendment, which I sent to the desk this morning, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) For the purpose of establishing safeguards with respect to the use of

appropriated and other funds, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the program for the procurement and construction of supplies, materials, munitions, vehicles, aircraft, vessels, plants, camps, and other articles and facilities in connection with the national defense, including—

(1) the types and terms of contracts awarded on behalf of the United States;

(2) the methods by which such contracts are awarded and contractors selected;

(3) the utilization of the facilities of small business concerns, through subcontracts or otherwise;

(4) the geographic distribution of contracts and location of plants and facilities;

(5) the effect of such program with respect to labor and the migration of labor;

(6) the performance of contracts and the accounting required of contractors;

(7) benefits accruing to contractors with respect to amortization for the purposes of taxation or otherwise;

(8) practices of management or labor, and prices, fees, and charges, which interfere with such program or unduly increase its cost; and

(9) such other matters as the committee deems appropriate. The committee shall report to the Senate, from time to time, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this section, which shall not exceed \$50,000 plus such additional sums as may be authorized by the Senate, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is simply that the committee may have an able staff whose duty and responsibility will be to check specifically the expenditure of funds as we proceed in the rearmament and redevelopment of our national defense. Sixty-one billion dollars is a tremendous sum of money. It will be necessary that we check the expenditure of these funds in order to assure that we are not appropriating excessively, and that we are getting a dollar's worth for every dollar expended.

For that purpose, Mr. President, this amendment will establish a watchdog committee comparable to the committee which was in existence during World War II, when there was a military expenditure and a defense program comparable with the present one. I believe the amendment is not only needed, but that it will accomplish much in obtaining economy in every division of the Federal Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am most happy to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was compelled to ask the Senator from Minnesota to yield because I notice the reference to an expenditure from the contingent fund, which would have to be approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I may say to the Senator that perhaps he is

not aware that what was practically the Truman committee, which was in existence during World War II, has been in existence for approximately 10 years, and is in existence today in the form of a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. Its chairman is the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I will say to the Senator further that at the present time the Committee on Rules and Administration has made available to the subcommittee \$190,000, which will be available until January. At that time we expect to renew the appropriation. So I feel that what the Senator from Minnesota is proposing is a duplication of an existing committee which has been performing very fine work.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I had given thought to that very question and had studied it, and I found on page 23 of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 753, second session, a reference to that very committee. I read from the law:

To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

I am familiar with the subcommittee to which the Senator from Arizona has referred, but it was my understanding that its function had more to do with the question of preparedness, such as stockpiling, and obtaining strategic material for the armament program, and it was not my understanding that it was in the category of obtaining information as to how funds are expended in the Defense Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator will refer to the resolution of the Committee on Armed Services authorizing the establishment of that subcommittee, he will find that it has complete authority in the field which he has outlined.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The language which the Senator from Minnesota read was in the law which was in effect during the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses. In the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] was the chairman of the so-called watchdog committee, and in the Eightieth Congress I was the chairman. The subcommittee which is now acting is under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. It was established by resolution last year, and is now acting under that resolution.

The subcommittee made a very exhaustive study of the subject of tin and another exhaustive study and report on the subject of rubber. It has made several investigations of overcrowding in

camps. In one instance, I remember, it eliminated graft of a rather minor character. I think there would be duplication of work if the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota should be adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for the amendment which he has offered. There is no doubt that for any adequate scrutiny of the funds appropriated by the pending bill the manpower resources of the Senate are inadequate. We are being asked to appropriate more than \$61,000,000. I am informed that the staff of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations consists of one man, who, I believe, is now present in the Senate. I believe the staff of the House committee consists of two men. Our manpower resources are not sufficient to deal with the situation. I suppose the Department of Defense employs thousands of men to prepare the budget, ably argue questions, and supply the figures when they are questioned by Members of the other body or of this body.

We must also face the fact that while the Bureau of the Budget may be valuable in bringing the requests of the armed services down to a figure which the President sets, when that budget once comes up on the Hill the Bureau of the Budget is certainly not the agency of Congress, but is the agency of the executive. The Bureau defends that budget rather than trying to find ways by which the taxpayers' burdens can be relieved. I think the Senator from Minnesota has taken a most constructive step, and I congratulate him upon the approach which he has made.

I should like to ask a question, if I may. Do I understand correctly that the committee is to be a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, or a special committee?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I will say to the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois that I introduced a joint resolution on this subject on May 28 of this year, but I have not been able to secure action on it. At that time by that joint resolution I endeavored to create a "watchdog committee." I cannot now see any other way to accomplish the purpose except to submit my proposal in the form of an amendment to the appropriation bill. That is why I have offered it as an amendment. I shall be most happy to have other Senators act as cosponsors of the amendment with me.

Mr. President, I have sat through all the Armed Services Subcommittee hearings I could possibly attend, listening to the budget requests by the various defense agencies and the various military agencies. I know that it is utterly impossible for me—and I question whether it is possible for anyone else—to determine whether we have squeezed out all the surplus from the budget requests. The way we can determine whether the funds will be wisely expended or not is by



having a "watchdog committee," which will investigate, not only on an accounting basis, but actually examine what is done in the construction of the various installations, as well as to investigate the manpower employed in the various branches and in the various plants as well as in the Military Establishment.

Mr. MORSE, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. THYE. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon, because he has been on his feet for a longer time than other Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota. Let me assure him, prior to my raising objections to his amendment, that I am of one mind with him for the need of the kind of investigation for which he is calling. I respectfully point out to him that I share the view of the Senator from Arizona, that the work which the Senator from Minnesota proposes to have done has already been started by the watchdog committee of the Armed Services Committee.

In my opinion, we are dealing here with a jurisdictional problem. I think the duty in question falls within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. I feel that when legislation of this character is passed, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate owes a responsibility to this body to see to it that the funds are properly spent in accordance with the legislative objectives of the Congress of the United States. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota will appreciate what I believe he will find to be the feeling and the attitude of the members of the Armed Services Committee, that we should be allowed to do our job under the able leadership of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. I can assure the Senator from Minnesota that I know of no more hard-working committee than the Preparedness Committee of the Armed Services Committee, as demonstrated by the reports it has already submitted this year.

To create another committee which would be bound to overlap, and duplicate the work of the Armed Services Committee, I respectfully say would not be in the interest of the efficient operation of the Senate. I think that what the Senator from Minnesota should do is to join with the rest of us in insisting that every possible facility be made available to the Johnson subcommittee so that it can carry on the studies that need to be made.

Therefore, I respectfully point out to the Senator from Minnesota that I believe he is offering an amendment to an appropriation bill which is legislation on an appropriation bill, and I raise a point of order to that effect.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. THYE. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan, who was first on his feet.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan first wishes to say, in reply to the Senator from Oregon, that he does not see the picture at all as the Senator from Oregon sees it. It is true that the Armed Services Committee has appointed an investigative subcommittee. But the Appropriations Committee is responsible for bringing to the Senate of the United States all the facts in relation to all moneys appropriated for the Armed Services. I know of no occasion when any testimony taken by the Armed Services Committee on questions of whether or not legislation should be enacted has ever been called to the attention of the Appropriations Committee. Naturally the Armed Services Committee takes the testimony; they obtain the evidence. They are familiar with it. It is in relation to matters with which they deal. They conduct hearings on the question as to whether or not the laws ought to be changed in relation to the armed services. But the Appropriations Committee has the responsibility of recommending the appropriation of dollars, and it is that committee which must obtain the knowledge as to the need for spending the public money in order that they may report proper measures for the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, so I may reply to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. In the first place, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that there is ample evidence available to him as to the suggestions the Armed Services Committee have made to the Appropriations Committee time and time again through members of the Armed Services Committee who have sat as ex-officio members of various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. The records of the Armed Services Committee have been called to the attention of the Appropriations Committee through those representatives. This year I have served as one of the ex-officio members of the Armed Services Committee in conferences with members of the Appropriations Committee, with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], for example, who is in charge of the bill which is now before the Senate. We have made our suggestions available to the Appropriations Committee time and time again. But I remind my good friend from Michigan that after the Appropriations Committee takes the testimony that causes it to bring forth an appropriation bill, and the appropriations have been made, and the departments to whom the appropriations have been made proceed to function under the legislation enacted it is the primary obligation of the committees that have jurisdiction over those departments to see to it that the policies called for by the appropriations are carried out. That is the function of a legislative com-

mittee. It is the function, for example, of the Armed Services Committee with regard to the Defense Department. If the Defense Department follows a policy which is not sound, the Armed Services Committee ought to call it to task. We should not have a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee functioning also as an Armed Services Committee because there will be nothing but jurisdictional strife if that is done.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I will say to the able and distinguished Senator from Oregon that as a member of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with appropriations for the armed services, I have sat in hearings conducted with respect to sundry items contained in the appropriation bill, and as a member of that subcommittee who has sat through most of the hearings I cannot this afternoon state that we have squeezed every unnecessary and surplus item out of this appropriation bill. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I feel that we have a responsibility to Congress and to the taxpayers to examine every item appropriated for in this bill, as it is being expended by the Defense Department, to make certain that the funds are wisely expended. I believe that the Appropriations Committee is the logical committee to have that responsibility upon it, because we must justify our recommendations for appropriations when the bill is brought before this body, and we have to justify to the Senate the various items contained in the appropriation bill. We must state that it is our opinion and our best judgment that the bill we have reported to the Senate is the best bill we can bring before this legislative body.

If we must defend it here, then I believe it is our responsibility to make certain that the funds provided throughout the biennium for which we are appropriating are wisely expended. It is for that reason that I introduced the joint resolution to begin with. It is one reason why I am trying to spike it to a bill which I know will be passed. I know that my resolution has not had consideration since last May 28, when it was introduced. That is why I am speaking in support of such a watchdog committee, to determine whether we are getting our dollar's worth out of every appropriation dollar which we now provide for the armed services and the Defense Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for what I think is the most constructive move of the past 3 days, something which is absolutely needed if we are to prevent military expenditures from absorbing the entire national vitality. He has made a contribution of the first magnitude.

Permit me to say that so far as the jurisdictional dispute which has arisen on the floor in the past few minutes is concerned, no group has done a better

job than the so-called Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The work which he has done in the field of tin and rubber, and in the field of overcrowding of the induction centers, has been of the first water. We are very proud of him. I told him once personally that I thought that during this session of the Senate he had perhaps made the greatest substantive contribution of any Member of the Senate. I affirm my statement.

However, the scope of the powers of his subcommittee is so broad that I think it is very difficult for it to concentrate on the specific field of acting as a watchdog over defense spending.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator from Illinois, I should like to pay my personal respects and commendation to the able and distinguished Senator from Texas for the work he is doing. However, I place him in an entirely different field from that which I am endeavoring to cover by this amendment. I place him in the military field, the field of determining whether the military is taking proper steps to make certain that it has the strategic materials to develop the defense which is necessary. I recognize that he has a responsibility to a soldier who has been inducted, to make certain that the soldier has clothing, to make certain that he has weapons with which to fight, to make certain that he has camp facilities which will not in any sense injure his health. In that field the subcommittee and its able chairman have done a most commendable job, and I support him at every step, if he needs my support. However, I feel that that is an entirely different field from that for which I am endeavoring to create a watchdog committee. It is the duty of the subcommittee of the Senator from Texas to see that the military have the materials to do with, but it is our job to see that the appropriations which we provide are properly expended. It is our job, if the appropriations are excessive, to see that they are not squandered. If they are excessive, there should be something left when we make a reexamination of the budget and of the appropriations which we previously made.

We are here today considering a \$61,000,000,000-plus appropriation bill. If we accept this amendment, we shall be providing \$50,000 to examine into the question as to how the \$61,000,000,000 is to be expended. I think there is a need to do exactly that.

I am not endeavoring to cast the slightest reflection upon the ability of the chairman of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Texas is the chairman. I am only endeavoring to give them an additional tool with which to work. That tool is a subcommittee within the Appropriations Committee, to determine whether there are excessive or foolish expenditures in the various military installations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the so-called Johnson committee is a good preparedness committee, but we need a special committee to watch the spending of the military authorities. Similarly, the Appropriations Committee has a broad range of subjects to cover, but is it not also true that a special committee is needed to concentrate on this one field, the \$61,000,000,000 field?

The staff of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations has, I believe, just left and walked into the cloakroom—the one man upon whom the Senate depends to furnish it with the facts concerning the appropriations of \$61,000,000,000—one man to protect the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I finish this observation?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Chair will permit me, I should like to yield to the senior Senator from Illinois. I may say that we have not taken up too much time in discussing the question of how to safeguard the taxpayer. I think the Chair would do well to permit a little further discussion before he rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is very sympathetic toward the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. However, the rules apply, and the Chair must attempt to abide by the rules.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I respectfully submit that I recognize that there is a rule with which the Chair must conform, but I believe that no Senator should become impatient if we spend a little time in discussing the question before the rule is invoked.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from Illinois, if the Chair will withhold his ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In this instance the Chair will be extremely lenient, and allow 2 minutes further discussion.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Military Establishment wishes to take an objective, what it does to set up a task force. That task force will normally have naval components, military components, aviation components, and sometimes marine components. Those are harmonized into an integrated force.

We now have before us the greatest task which the Senate has ever faced. This time there is an appropriation of \$61,000,000,000, and there will be countless billions ahead in the future. Is it not appropriate that we should set up a task force to deal with this appropriation? I am wondering if perhaps we should not have a special committee, consisting of some members of the Appropriations Committee, some members of the Armed Services Committee, and possibly some members drawn from the

body of the Senate, to integrate the work of the committees, but with the special task—I will not say of riding herd, but of watching with a solicitous eye the expenditures of the military to see whether they are wasteful or proper, and to make recommendations for future appropriations.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from New York, who has been on his feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So far the Chair is convinced that the debate is on the merits of the amendment, and not on the point of order. Therefore, the question of jurisdiction has no relationship to the point of order of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The amendment is in violation of paragraph 4 of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and in the opinion of the Chair is not in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to speak on the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Before the Chair rules on the point of order, I should like to call attention to the fact that this may not be legislation. I read from pages 159 and 160 of the rules of the Senate:

Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committees) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members in addition to the clerical staffs on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office—

In other words, there is a limitation on the number of professionals, and the number of clerks—

and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Each such committee is further authorized to terminate the services by a majority vote of the committee of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

(B) Professional members for Committee on Appropriations, examinations of executive agencies' operation: Subject to appropriations which it shall be in order to include in appropriation bills, the Committee on Appropriations of each House is authorized to appoint such staff, in addition to the clerk thereof and assistants for the minority, as each such committee, by a majority vote, shall determine to be necessary, such personnel, other than the minority assistants, to possess such qualifications as the committees respectively may prescribe, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House also is authorized to conduct studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive agency (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) as it may deem necessary to



assist it in connection with the determination of matters within its jurisdiction and in accordance with the procedures authorized by the committee by a majority vote, including the rights and powers conferred by House Resolution Numbered 50, adopted January 9, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If that be the case, it appears to the Chair that the amendment would not be necessary.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I believe I still have the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. May I be heard in response to the Senator from Michigan?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. THYE. When did the Senator from Minnesota lose the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has made a ruling on the point of order.

Mr. THYE. Then I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota to withhold his appeal for a moment.

The section of the rule which was read by the Senator from Michigan clearly shows, it seems to me, that the Senate has the power to expand the staff of the Appropriations Committee if it desires to do so. The question was under consideration briefly yesterday in the Appropriations Committee when the legislative appropriation bill was under consideration. If I had not been detained upon the floor by the responsibility of trying to get the pending bill passed, I would have discussed with the committee the propriety of expanding the staff of the Appropriations Committee for the purpose of doing what is proposed by the Senator, because I have a very clear feeling that the Appropriations Committee, which recommends the appropriations, ought to pursue the matter.

I am in complete agreement with the objectives of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], but I am wondering if it would not be a very good idea, in view of the great importance of the pending bill, and the substantive amendments which are still to be considered, for the Senator to withhold his amendment and present it again when the legislative bill comes up.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is on the floor. He is in charge of the legislative appropriation bill. He is thoroughly familiar with the Reorganization Act, and with all the rules of the Senate. I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that it would expedite consideration of the pending appropriation bill and expedite the attainment of the objective the Senator has in mind, in all probability, if he would be good enough now to accept the decision of the Chair and let us proceed with the pending bill.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming

that if we keep putting this subject off there will always be presented an argument why it should be put off again. The same argument could be made when the legislative appropriation bill comes before the Senate. I can see no better time than now to try to nail some safeguard to this huge appropriation bill.

Mr. President, anyone who has had governmental experience knows what it is going to be like when all the various agencies in the Defense Department proceed to spend \$61,000,000,000. It is for that reason, knowing that the members of the Appropriations Committee are oftentimes working more than they are physically fit to work, and far more than a man should be compelled to work, in their endeavors to obtain some information relative to the items in an appropriation bill, that there should be the addition to the staff which I propose. If the Committee on Appropriations is to act as a "watchdog committee," and if we are to ask the staff, which is already overworked, to proceed to an examination of all the installations and all the activities of the Defense Department, and if we are to have the type of inspection and investigation which the taxpayers are entitled to have, we shall definitely have to add to the staff of the Committee on Appropriations. We must have some experts in the field of accounting to give the members of the committee relief in their endeavors to find out how the funds are being expended. Therefore, I am reluctant to give up the fight, and I say we should not put it off any longer. Tomorrow will come, and another request will be made to put it off another day.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. What the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], read shows that there is already a law on the statute books which provides that any time the Committee on Appropriations desires to do so, it can add to its personnel to whatever extent it may desire.

I thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Minnesota has said about the necessity of expanding the staff. After talking with other members of the committee, I am convinced that it should be done. However, we do not have to amend this bill to do it. Provisions for doing it is already on the statute books. We would merely be tacking to this bill a provision which is already contained in the law.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if we have the timber, and if we have the tools, so to speak, let us go ahead and nail something together so that we will have it in service and operation. If we do that, we can determine whether we are getting a dollar's worth out of every dollar of appropriations we make.

I now yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who has been on his feet a long time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am in full agreement with the purposes of the amendment offered by the distinguished

Senator from Minnesota. I have voted against many proposed cuts, and I intend to vote against many more, not that I disagree with the purposes of the cuts, but because I have had the feeling that in most cases they are clearly hit-and-miss cuts, and are not based on any facts known to any Member of the Senate, possibly with the exception of some members of the appropriate committees.

I do not believe that the Senate, when refusing to make cuts on a hit-and-miss basis, should be willing to surrender its control over at least the supervision of the expenditures which have been authorized by this body. Therefore I believe that it would be in the interest of good government and in the interest of economy, and possibly in the interest of increasing efficiency, if we adopted the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I believe there can be no question that what he proposes would be legislation on an appropriation bill. The Parliamentarian has so advised us. It would be a bad precedent if, every time some of us were for or against the merits of a proposition, we decided to overrule the decision of the Chair. The rules of the Senate have been established for orderly procedure. The Senate cannot afford to overrule the Chair merely because his decision happens not to suit the ideas of some of us whenever we favor an amendment. If we did it in one instance, no doubt it would be done in other instances. Surely the Senate of the United States is not going to set the precedent of overruling decisions of the Chair, merely because the Chair's decision runs counter to the desires of some of us with regard to a certain proposition.

If I may have the further indulgence of my good friend from Minnesota, I desire to emphasize that I agree fully with his objective. Certainly we should watch carefully the expenditure of every tax dollar.

We know, of course that overlapping of functions and duties exists in many departments of the Government. However, merely because there is an overlapping in the departments of the Government is no excuse for the Senate to overlap in its work. We already have a "watchdog committee" which has done notable work. The distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee who are working under the chairmanship of the able junior Senator from Texas are experienced in this particular field.

I have the utmost confidence in the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the work that his subcommittee is doing. If we wish to expand the work of the Preparedness Subcommittee by providing a little more money and a somewhat larger staff, I believe that this subcommittee will meet the needs of the situation.

I realize that the field in which the Preparedness Subcommittee operates is one in which many Senators would like to participate. I also realize that frequently we let our desires prejudice our views, although I do not make that statement in respect to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, because I know he is trying to reach a certain goal. However, in all sincerity I say that the Senate cannot afford to change the rule by overriding the decision of the Presiding Officer, inasmuch as the rule is perfectly plain. I hope the Senate will not do so.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, let me say to the majority leader that I have no intention of casting a reflection upon any Member of the Senate and, in particular, I have not the slightest intention of casting any reflection upon the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. However, I had a feeling that his subcommittee was operating in an entirely different field from the one to which the amendment relates.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know the Senator from Minnesota is aware of Senate Resolution 18, which was submitted to the Senate in January of this year by the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. THYE. Yes, I am aware of it, particularly in view of the fact that I have had a copy of it on my desk all day, in order that by my amendment I would not in any way invade the field covered by the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. THYE. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Armed Services Committee has submitted a resolution creating a Preparedness Subcommittee, and that resolution has been adopted. So far as I can tell, there is nothing in the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota that is not already covered by the resolution of the Armed Services Committee.

I have no disposition to ask the Senate not to appropriate to the Appropriations Committee whatever money it may need in order to have a proper staff. However, as I understand, the Appropriations Committee has made no such request.

At this moment the Armed Services Committee has a staff which has made approximately 30 reports, a copy of each of which has been sent to each Member of the Senate. From time to time the committee has asked the Senate to present its recommendations in regard to any matter which Senators felt should be investigated. I may say that not a day passes but that the Preparedness Subcommittee has dozens of requests for investigations from businessmen, private citizens, and from Members of the Senate. The staff of the Preparedness Sub-

committee is presently engaged in studying and investigating all those complaints.

The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota would merely result in a duplication of the provisions of that resolution of the Armed Services Committee. We of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee do not find that the scope or the power or the authority of the committee are such as to prevent us from making the desirable studies and investigations. The only thing which limits us in that respect is the funds available to us.

If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to have a more thorough or more exhaustive or more detailed investigation made, all he needs to do is to call upon the Committee on Rules and Administration and insist that it agree that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate be provided with the amount of money necessary to supervise the expenditure of the \$61,000,000,000 carried in this appropriation bill.

However, the Preparedness Subcommittee within the limit of its funds is going to do everything it possibly can to supervise the expenditure of the money in this appropriation bill. I believe that is what was intended by the Reorganization Act.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have been on the floor of the Senate at least three times when the Senator from Texas has made a report from his Preparedness Subcommittee, and each of those reports was on the question of preparedness and defense, not on the question of how the military had expended any of the funds made available to them.

It was with the knowledge that we have received from that subcommittee reports regarding what was being done in military camps, that I submitted my amendment. I can recall when the Senator from Texas stated that our defense was not armor, but was only chicken wire. I recall that.

It is for those reasons that I submitted the amendment. I submitted it because the subcommittee was confining itself to the preparedness question, and I wish to have set up a subcommittee staff which will have the specific duty of determining whether we were getting a dollar's worth of goods or services for each dollar of appropriations provided by the pending measure.

I wish to emphasize the point that I am not reflecting upon or attempting to reflect upon the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I pay them a tribute for doing the job called for by Senate Resolution 18, namely, determining whether we really are obtaining preparedness and whether we have sufficient strategic materials for that purpose. So I was not casting any reflection upon the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has been seeking recognition for some time. However, if he will pardon me for a moment, I should like to yield first to the Senator from Texas, to permit him to continue his statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a proposal which may help dispose of this matter.

Mr. THYE. Very well; then I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. My proposal is that the appeal from the decision of the Chair be withdrawn by the Senator from Minnesota, and that he ask for the handling of this matter by the Appropriations Committee.

As I view the Senator's proposal, it contemplates something entirely different from what the Preparedness Subcommittee, headed by the Senator from Texas, is doing at this time.

So I hope the Senator from Minnesota will withdraw the amendment, and will offer it later in connection with the legislative appropriation bill. At that time I should like to join him in sponsoring the amendment, if it is offered in connection with the appropriations for the legislative branch.

Mr. THYE. I shall be most happy to do so.

It is not my intention to labor this point, Mr. President. However, before I take my seat, I should like to hear what the Senator from Texas has to say in commenting on my remarks. Therefore I yield to him at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I appreciate very much the nice things the Senator from Minnesota has said about our committee and about the Preparedness Subcommittee and its reports which he has observed. As a matter of fact, the Preparedness Subcommittee has made approximately 30 reports in the fields of manpower, housing, training, and materials. It was our feeling that the first studies should be in the fields of manpower and materials. The contracts which are made for procurement purposes relate to both manpower and materials, of course.

We now have under way investigations relating to the procurement field. One of them involves the General Motors Corp., in connection with the production of a number of airplane motors.

We have felt that under this resolution we had complete authority to investigate everything the Senator from Minnesota contemplates.

If the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Michigan have in mind anything which they feel the committee has not considered, but should consider, the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee will be very glad to have them call it to his attention.

I wish to read two paragraphs of the resolution creating the Preparedness Subcommittee. If the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Minnesota had read the resolution I think they



would have realized that the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee now has adequate authority to do the very thing for which they are requesting authority and money.

I now read from the resolution:

It shall be the function of such subcommittee to conform with section 136 of such act by exercising a continuous watchfulness over matters within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, through a continuous study of policies, programs, activities, operations, facilities, requirements, and practices of the Department of Defense, the armed services, and other agencies exercising functions relating to them and the administration thereof in all respects.

The purposes of such watchfulness and study shall include the determination whether (1) such policies, programs, activities, operations, facilities, requirements, and practices are the most effective possible in the interest of national defense; and (2) the administration of such policies, programs, activities, operations, facilities, requirements, and practices is characterized by maximum efficiency.

I say to the Senator from Minnesota that it is my thought that the amendment he proposes calls for an exact duplication of the function and authority which the preparedness subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee already has and already is exercising.

The able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], on their side of the aisle, sit on that committee; and if there are any matters which we have overlooked, or if there is anything which the Senator wishes to have studied, but which has not been studied, within the limit of our funds—not within the limit of our authority, because we have ample authority to do everything his amendment contemplates, and it calls for a mere duplication of something which the Armed Services Committee has been doing since July 1950—we shall be glad to study it.

So it seems strange to me that we would spend hours talking about economy and about saving money in the executive departments of the Government and about avoiding duplication, and yet the Senate would consider creating two committees to do the same thing and to have the same authority and to make reports on the same matters.

It may be that the Armed Services Committee and its Preparedness Subcommittee have not investigated everything the Senator from Minnesota would like to have us investigate. But all he needs to do, in order to have studied any subject within the purview of the Preparedness Subcommittee is to refer it to us. We have now many studies under way. It has been the feeling of the Senator from Texas that in the 12 months during which we have operated, with the 30 reports which we have submitted, going into the efficiency of operation of the Defense Department, going into its procurement and its contracts, going into its housing, and going into its utilization of manpower, we have served the purpose for which we were created.

I have no particular pride in this special subcommittee. If it is the feeling of the Senate that another committee should handle the matter, I should be very glad to give to that committee some of the hard work which we have been doing. I do want the Senate to know that it has one committee now which is doing the work, that \$190,000 has been appropriated for the work, and that 30 reports, covering a rather wide field, have been submitted during the past 12 months. The only thing that limits the operation of that committee is the matter of money.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that it has been my understanding and my observation that that subcommittee is itself dealing with the questions involving preparedness, whether we have strategic materials, and whether we have the supplies and all that is necessary in order to develop our defense. But the Appropriations Committee is the committee which ultimately must make the decisions on the appropriations. If we have erred in our judgment and have appropriated too much money, we are to be held responsible. If we have erred in our judgment and have not appropriated sufficient funds, we shall have to stand judgment for not providing the military and the armed services with the necessary funds with which to prepare themselves as they should have been prepared. So I say that the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services is charged with the responsibility of examining into the question of the preparedness of our military forces, and it is not staffed for, and is not charged with, the responsibility of determining whether the dollars appropriated have been wisely spent.

Mr. President, in this day, when we are appropriating the billions of dollars which are called for by this bill and with the prospect of our spending \$100,000,000,000 on the defense program before we are finally through with it, if that is the sum of money we are to extract from the taxpayers, we need not only one committee for the study of the question of preparedness, but we need another committee to determine whether there was too much enthusiasm for preparedness and whether we are spending money which it might not have been necessary to spend.

But, Mr. President, in view of the fact that a point of order has been made, I shall not press the question further, but will take it up at some later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if no Senator present wishes to offer an amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am informed that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is prepared to proceed with his amendment. In

view of that fact, and in view of the fact that there will be another opportunity for a quorum call before a final vote on the bill, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment designated "9-11-51—B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 35, between lines 3 and 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

Total expenditures of funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be limited to 95 percent of the total amount appropriated by this paragraph.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a proposal to introduce a further cut of 5 percent in the amount paid for civilian personnel of the Department of the Army at the seat of government here in Washington, D. C., in such offices as the Judge Advocate General's, The Adjutant General's, the Chief of Ordnance, and the like.

Before going into the merits of the amendment, I should like to pay tribute to the Army for its clear-cut budget presentation. In the Navy and Air Force budget one cannot get a clear picture of the overhead. It is covered up in other items. The Army on the other hand has set forth, in detail, the precise location and the amounts involved on its overhead personnel so that Congress can get an accurate picture of it. For this, I think the Army deserves the highest praise and that the Navy and Air Force should follow this excellent example.

The history of this situation is as follows: As I understand, at the height of World War II, when there were between thirteen and fourteen million men in the armed services, there were approximately 23,000 civilian and military personnel in the Pentagon. That was in the ratio of 1 employee in the Pentagon for approximately 500 men in the Armed Forces as a whole. I do not know the present population of the Pentagon, and I suggest that it would be very interesting for the United States Census, if it has resources adequate to deal with this matter, to take such a census. But according to the last information I have, which is somewhat out of date, there are roughly 34,000 men and women in the Pentagon.

PROPORTION OF OVERHEAD PERSONNEL GREATER NOW THAN IN WORLD WAR II

The Armed Forces of the United States do not exceed 3,500,000, so that the ratio, therefore, is 1 Pentagonite for approximately every 100 persons in the armed services.

In other words, although we are engaged in what is certainly only a minor war, comparatively speaking, there are in the Pentagon employees in administrative positions in the ratio of 1 to 100 now as compared with 1 to 500 at the height of the greatest war in human

history. While perhaps certain qualifications should be made, because in World War II the Navy was outside the Pentagon, and now has been largely brought under the wing of the Department of Defense, that still does not entirely explain the difference.

Mr. President, the evidence indicates that there is approximately three times the overhead here in Washington now that there was at the height of World War II. I understand that, under the leadership of Secretary Pace and Assistant Secretary Johnson the present overhead ratio in the Army is much better than it was in 1942.

There are approximately two divisions of people in the Pentagon. It is true that not all of them wear the uniform, but if they were not in the Pentagon, they could either be in the active services, or they could be in industries connected with the war effort.

Mr. President, I lament the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has only one staff member to deal with this huge \$61,000,000,000 appropriation. I hope that either the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota or that of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to create a joint committee on the budget will be accepted, to have the appropriation groups adequately staffed so that we may know what we are doing. Both these Senators have made very constructive suggestions. I desire to include also the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], because he joined in the suggestions made, I believe, with particular interest in the bill to create a joint budget committee, inasmuch as he is a member of the Senate Expenditures Committee which reported that bill.

#### OVERSTAFFING IN THE PENTAGON

If there is one matter upon which Senators are expert, I mean the common, garden-variety of us sitting here on the floor of the Senate, it is that there is overstaffing at the Pentagon. Everyone of us has constituents and friends at the Pentagon, and while they have a feeling of loyalty to the service for which they are working, nevertheless they have also a feeling of loyalty to the country, and they tell us upon occasion of the gross overstaffing which exists in the Pentagon.

I suppose no one is to blame for this. I suppose it is like Topsy, it has just "grown."

I wish to make it clear that I am not reflecting on the patriotism of those at the Pentagon. I hope it will not be said that I am attacking their character. I certainly am not. They are excellent men and women, I am sure, highly devoted to duty, highly patriotic. I am sure the percentage of church membership among them is as high as that to be found in our citizenship as a whole. I am sure they are kind to their wives and children. I have been in the homes of some of them, and I can testify that they take good care of the flowers in their gardens, and that the pansies and petunias they raise are just as good as those raised by anyone. So I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not at-

tacking the character of these people. And I hope I am not impeding the war effort by suggesting that there are too many of them in the Pentagon.

That is the whole point—there are too many of them there.

Mr. President, what I am trying to do is to cut out one of the major diseases of the military system, which is the tendency to expand personnel in the upper echelons. The amendment which I suggest would save about \$3,354,000—peanuts, to be sure, but it would release over a battalion. The amendment would affect civilian personnel, and its adoption would mean the release of the equivalent of over a battalion of people to more productive service.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator's amendment has not been taken care of already, because the limit has been reduced from 530,000 to 500,000, and there is a provision that it covers personnel, temporary, as well as permanent, and also consultants, which probably will result in reducing the number even more than would be accomplished by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the proposal to which the Senator from Michigan refers is the so-called 5-percent cut as applied to the civilian employees as a whole under a directive issued by Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg, but what I am trying to reduce, specifically, is the number of civilian employees at the seat of Government, and to impose a further 5-percent cut in the salaries of Army officers in the Pentagon.

Mr. President, when the various congressional committees went into the question of the overstaffing of the Pentagon, that gave strength to the hope that Mrs. Rosenberg would impose a 5-percent cut in the total personnel, civilian and military, in the Pentagon, to take effect in July. That order has gone into effect, and I want to pay tribute to Mrs. Rosenberg for doing what she did. Probably she would not have been able to prevail upon her colleagues in the Pentagon had it not been for the assistance which Congress gave her, but it was a very good act on the part of Congress, and she has carried it out excellently.

Mr. President, I desire to point out, if I may, that at the instance of the senior Senator from Michigan we have imposed a 10-percent cut on personnel in civilian agencies, but the Army thought it was making a great concession when it agreed to a 5-percent cut in the Pentagon. I should also like to point out, if I may, that probably there is as much overstaffing in the military agencies in Washington as there is in the civilian agencies. Since we have applied a 10-percent cut to the civil branch of the Government, it would seem, in all fairness, that we should also apply a 10-percent cut to the Military Establishment here in Washington. This amendment is di-

rected only to civilian employees. It does not deal with military employees.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator from Illinois was not on the floor when an amendment was adopted to reduce the 530,000 limitation to 500,000. We have also reduced the number by including not only full-time civilians, but part-time consultants. So we have, in effect, I think, reduced the number approximately 10 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may state to the Senator from Michigan that I am very glad that amendment was adopted. I was not on the floor when it was agreed to. But the reduction to which he invites attention is a reduction in number of personnel, and applies the country over, not merely in Washington.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not a reduction in amount of money. The amendment which I offer provides for a reduction of a further 5 percent in the amount of money.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois can be accepted, because it would be in line with the amendment to which I have just referred.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I am glad the amendment restricting personnel has been adopted. My amendment would seal that achievement and restrict the appropriation of money for Army offices in the Pentagon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to confirm what the Senator from Michigan has said, that the Senate by its action on the general over-all personnel ceiling seems to have accomplished what the senior Senator from Illinois desires to accomplish by his amendment. The history of what happened while the Senator was off the floor was this: That the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] offered an amendment providing for an over-all 10 percent cut. Discussion ensued during which the whole matter was rather thoroughly explored, as I thought, and the junior Senator from Illinois finally was persuaded that the members of the committee were correct in their point of view, and he changed his amendment. He abandoned the proposal to make an over-all 10-percent cut, instead of the 5-percent cut the Senator from Illinois seeks, and accepted in lieu thereof the reduction of the original committee amendment from 530,000 to 500,000.

There is another reason why I feel that the Senator's amendment should not be adopted at this point, and I hope I may be able to persuade him that I am correct. We have already adopted amendments which have increased the personnel because of perfectly understandable reasons. For example, in the



Office of the Secretary of the Army we increased the appropriation so as to provide 12 additional employees whose duty would be to carry on the renegotiation of contracts involving these huge sums.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will read my amendment, he will find that I am reducing by 5 percent the total amounts appropriated by the paragraph in question, not the individual amounts appropriated in the specific lines of the paragraph. The Secretary of the Army would have discretionary power to apportion these cuts as he thought best. So that if there are particular sections in the top Army officers in the Pentagon which are understaffed—it seems incredible to believe that there are any sections in the Pentagon that are understaffed—but if there are, those can be exempted, and the cut would be an overall figure of \$3,354,000, which could be apportioned amongst the various sections and divisions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us consider the Office of the Chief of Ordnance. There the request was for a restoration of \$367,000. We denied that request and allowed only \$250,000. In the case of the Quartermaster General, he wanted a restoration of 122 persons. We allowed a restoration of only 61. In the Office of the Judge Advocate General the committee recommended a total increase of eight persons for the purpose of implementing the new law providing for an appellate procedure. All in all, these increases authorized by the committee in this paragraph amount to about \$860,000.

The total amount carried in this particular appropriation is—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Sixty-seven million seventy-nine thousand nine hundred dollars.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois is quite correct.

My own feeling is that because of what we have already done the Senator's amendment is not necessary. But if the Senator insists upon the amendment I am willing to accept it and take it to conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming, and I will make the conventional reply that I hope he takes it to conference with a strong heart and not with the intention of strangling the amendment to death in the tower.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think I may be permitted to say to the Senator from Illinois that I believe I have a strong heart. I can take the things that happen on the floor. It has not been my practice to speak out of two sides of my mouth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moovy in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois lettered "B."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now offer my amendment 9-10-51-K, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39, line 10, it is proposed to strike "\$1,050,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,003,356,000."

On page 40, line 3, it is proposed to strike "\$1,537,452,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,526,952,000."

On page 41, line 17, it is proposed to strike "\$1,335,668,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,320,468,000."

On page 47, line 9, it is proposed to strike "\$3,215,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,104,850,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Illinois was going to explain the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had intended to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is a very substantial cut of almost \$50,000,000 in the appropriation for the construction of aircraft and related procurement. I cannot bring myself to accept the amendment because it deals with one of the most vital aspects of this appropriation bill. If there is one thing upon which the committee was unanimous it was upon its desire to make certain that the United States has an expanded Air Force. This is a provision that deals specifically with the Air Force of the Navy. If the amendment were to be adopted it would mean a reduction of some \$47,000,000. It would be a vote to cut 60 aircraft from the expansion of naval air power, or in more realistic terms, it would be the equivalent of 4 modern fighter squadrons. In view of the great need for the expansion of air power, I think the amendment of the Senator from Illinois should not be adopted.

#### AMENDMENT AIMED AT REDUCING GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF MACHINERY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am afraid that our good friend the Senator from Wyoming and his associates have misunderstood the nature of the amendment. It is not directed at reducing the number of aircraft. It is directed at an area of the budget called expediting production. At least it bears that title in the Army budget, although it carries a different name in the Navy and Air Force, and in those services it is not carried as a separate item in the bill. Instead it is included within other items in the bill, which is why I have had to offer four separate amendments. Under the items which include funds for this purpose of the military asked for a total of approximately \$3,000,000,000 to purchase tools, equipment and machinery to which the Government will hold title, but which will be used by the contractors in producing for the various branches of the military service. It is also going to be used to build or to rehabilitate Government-owned plants, primarily for the production of highly classified items.

Mr. President, in the remarks I made on Monday I pointed out that this ap-

propriation of \$3,000,000,000 which the Defense Department is requesting, is in addition to the some nine and a third billion dollars of accelerated tax amortization which have already been granted by the Defense Production Administration. It is in addition to the loan guaranties which have been granted, and to the direct loans which either have been or will be granted. It is an appropriation by the Government to furnish tools, equipment and machinery, to put these into private establishments, the private establishments then using them.

Then, of course, the question always comes up: What is to happen to them after the war? While some of these will have a specialized wartime use, there are others, such as heavy presses for aircraft, which can be made available for peacetime work, as well as for wartime work. It seems to me that for machinery which is useful in peacetime, such as heavy presses, lathes, drills, and so forth, we need not spend so much money. Rather, we can provide incentive to concerns through direct loans and accelerated amortization tax certificates. The same holds true for plant construction.

After the last war a great deal of this equipment for which we spent a total of \$7,500,000,000 was sold at ridiculously low figures to the industrial concerns which had used them during the war. Certainly some of this equipment must still be in existence, but this is a proposal to spend \$3,000,000,000 more.

When this question was submitted to the House, the House Appropriations Committee made a 10-percent cut in the budget request of approximately \$1,100,000,000 for this purpose for the Army, but it did not make a corresponding cut in the one-billion-eight-hundred-million-odd dollars requested for the Navy and the Air Force. I think this may possibly have been a mere technical oversight on the part of the House. It seems to me logical that it intended to make a 10 percent across the board. This is highly probable, since the item for the Army is labeled as "Expediting production" while the items for the same purpose in the Navy and Air Force sections of the bill are included in other headings. This is pointed up by the fact that the House committee in its report, specifically directed that this program be reevaluated. Since the principle involved is precisely the same for the Navy and the Air Force, one might surmise the House wanted the program reevaluated across the board, although I cannot speak for the House.

I cannot see how our holding back 10 percent on these appropriations will appreciably reduce the number of aircraft produced. It seems to me that this is an attempt to put a little checkrein on, to see that the money is not lavished as widely as it otherwise would be, and that more careful exploration of other expansion incentives, such as accelerated amortization or loan guaranties, particularly in the case of equipment with probable peacetime usefulness.

We remember the colloquy when the Senator from Connecticut, in connection with the Defense Production Act, proposed that the Government, through DPA and NPA, should have the power of directly constructing industrial plants. His proposal, I believe, involved only a few hundred million dollars. That was turned down by a vote of this body, and some rather severe language was applied to it by certain Members of the Senate. Now we have a proposal for many, many times that amount—\$3,000,000,000, to be expended through the Defense Department, for much the same purpose except that the potential benefits to private concerns is greater. What I am trying to do is to say that if this is socialism, my proposal is to have 10 percent less socialism, than we otherwise would have. In that process \$183,000,000 would be saved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me add that I quite agree with the Senator from Illinois in his general attitude toward the excessive certificates of amortization which have been granted to many corporations which may be engaged in defense production. The Senator, as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, is well aware of that fact. But I have no reason to believe that an appropriation which is contained in this bill for the purchase of machine tools has anything in the world to do with the excessive profits which may be reaped by reason of such certificates of convenience and necessity. The way to attack excessive profits from war contracts is by way of renegotiation, in the first place, for which we have provided, and in the second place, by way of taxation. When the tax bill comes before the Senate I think we shall have an opportunity to make certain that any excessive profits which may be reaped from war contracts may be recovered and paid into the revenue of the Federal Government.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The point which the Senator from Wyoming is making shows the essential difference between working on excess profits by renegotiation and by the excess-profits tax. The excess-profits tax is by its nature a percentage proposition, which applies to all producers and all plants indiscriminately. Renegotiation makes it possible to take into consideration whether the investment in the plant is a private investment of the plant owner, or whether a part of the plant capital is provided by the Government. That is the use of the renegotiation process.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from South Dakota is quite right. As was stated earlier in the day, the Senator from South Dakota was largely responsible in the House during World War II for the adoption of the renegotiation procedure.

My point with respect to this amendment, however, is that by reducing the appropriation for the procurement of machine tools we necessarily lower the ability of the aircraft manufacturer to produce the aircraft which are needed.

I think that the amendment is excessive. If the machine tools are not produced, then the production of aircraft will necessarily be reduced, and I believe my original statement is altogether correct, that it would involve a reduction of \$47,000,000, which could be converted, in terms of reduction of the number of aircraft produced, into a reduction of 60 aircraft, or four modern fighter squadrons.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I was present in the subcommittee hearing when this very item was discussed. I realize that it involves a tremendous sum of money. It might seem possible to bring about an economy in this item; but we are engaged in a cold-war operation. If we devote our plants to maximum production, we may create vast yards full of equipment, such as planes, tanks, and what have you, which will stand idle and deteriorate. In the event that we should need tools, plants, and equipment for all-out production, we could not find a substitute. We could not then proceed to tool. We could not then proceed to get the plant facilities to bring about all-out production if the emergency should require it. So while we are appropriating today, we are oftentimes appropriating for facilities for all-out production, but facilities which will be operated at a more or less limited capacity. That is the only way we can deal with the problem during the cold-war period with which we are faced.

While the item which is now before us in the appropriation bill was being discussed by the armed services, some of the information given us was highly classified and off the record. It could not be printed in the public report which is before us. The chairman of the subcommittee asked hundreds of questions of the military authorities, and the questions and answers do not appear in this record, because the information was classified.

Mr. President, I admire the senior Senator from Illinois in his efforts to bring about economy. While I should like to support him, and while it is embarrassing to many of us when we do not support the economy effort, yet I know, as a member of the subcommittee, that we felt, after all the testimony had been taken, that we were entirely justified in writing into the appropriation bill the items which now appear in it.

I will say to the senior Senator from Illinois that if I vote against him, as I shall do on this amendment, I shall do so regretfully, knowing very well that my vote will be misunderstood by every taxpayer when he reads the newspaper columns stating that members of the Appropriations Committee voted against the effort of the Senator from Illinois to economize.

However, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that much testimony was given us in the hearings which does not appear in this record. The chairman of the subcommittee spent

many hours personally questioning the military authorities, in his endeavor to get all the facts and to squeeze out every dollar that could be squeezed out of the appropriation. So I say again that when I vote against the distinguished Senator from Illinois on this amendment, as I shall do in connection with some of the other amendments, I do so reluctantly, but I do so because I know that we got all the information from the armed services, and that we felt, as members of the subcommittee, justified in recommending these items to the full committee; and the full committee saw fit to make the recommendations to the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in the event consideration of the pending bill is not completed today—and it is evident that it will not be finished—that beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon debate be limited to 30 minutes on each amendment, motion, or appeal, 15 minutes to be allotted to each side, to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment or motion, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]; provided that in the event the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] favors the amendment or motion, the time in opposition be controlled by the distinguished minority leader the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or any other Senator acting in his place; provided further that debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the distinguished minority leader the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], or any Senator he may designate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, I know of no objection on this side of the aisle. I believe the Senator from North Dakota may have something to say on the subject. The Senator from North Dakota has just returned to the Chamber. Will the Senator from Arizona repeat his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LANGER. I know what it is. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan intends to propose an amendment to cut 10 percent from this bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it was not my intention to do so with respect to this bill. The reason for it is that while this is an enormous bill, much of it is for equipment and supplies, and the Senator from Michigan feels that this is a matter that must be left generally to the military authorities.

After a very close and thorough examination by the various members of the committee I have been compelled to come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to do it under the circumstances at this time, considering the question of



defense of America, as I see it. We did reduce the civilian personnel today, as the Senator from Michigan had proposed to do in committee, by approximately 10 percent. We have reduced the number from 546,000 to approximately 500,000, and we have put a limitation on the number. We have applied the cut to consultants and part-time employees. In effect we have reduced the civilian personnel by 10 percent, which is in line with what the Senator from Michigan provided in his previous amendments.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Michigan know of any other Senator who will offer such an amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe the Senator from Vermont intends to do so.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to say that I plan to make—and I have announced that I shall make—a motion, which will have the effect of making a 10-percent reduction. It will be before the Senate in a somewhat different form, owing to circumstances of contractual obligations of the Government, and things of that sort. I assure the Senator from North Dakota, if he is interested, that he will have an opportunity to vote on an equivalent 10-percent cut.

Mr. LANGER. With the time being divided, could the Senator from Vermont yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes. I am glad to yield 5 minutes to him. I do so right now.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not wish to object, but I do not like a limitation of 30 minutes of debate on the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to make it longer.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the unanimous-consent agreement provide for a total of 30 minutes of debate on the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. A total of 30 minutes on the bill. The bill has been debated for 3 days.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand. Under the circumstances I would be obliged to object to such a limitation, because it would be impossible, if any Senator wanted to speak on the bill, to be recognized for 10, 15, or 20 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall extend the time for a limitation of debate on the bill to 1 hour. That is the usual time provided for debate on a bill under a unanimous-consent agreement. The time, of course, would be divided equally.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe that on a bill of this character any Member of the Senate who wishes to speak on it finally should have the right to speak. If only 15 minutes of debate is permitted to a side it would be impossible to be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have amended the request to extend the debate on the bill to 1 hour.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would an hour be agreeable to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. I am anxious to help expedite the consideration of the bill. It is quite likely that I shall wish to take 15 or 20 minutes on the bill. It is a very important bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia. I believe the Senator from Georgia is perfectly right in feeling that discussion of a bill of this importance, with its vast implications, should not be limited to such a narrow scope as originally proposed. The majority leader is quite willing to extend the time.

I was going to suggest the possibility that debate on the bill should be limited to the time that any Senator desires to take.

Mr. GEORGE. I would have no objection to 15 minutes for any Senator desiring to speak.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would prefer to make the time limit on the bill an hour and a half. When we have a limitation applied to Senators, they may rise and speak about matters other than the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that if he will modify the unanimous-consent request, particularly the latter part of it, to provide that debate upon the bill shall be limited to 15 minutes to each Senator who chooses to speak on it, but that his debate must be germane to the bill—

Mr. McFARLAND. I believe we should conform to the usual form of unanimous-consent requests. I have no particular objection, but if the Senator from Georgia desires to use 15 minutes, and if an hour and a half should be provided on each side—

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know that I shall use any time, but I deem this to be a very important bill. It is the most staggering bill the Senate has ever considered. All through World War I did we in one bill ever appropriate as much as \$61,000,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator believe that an hour and a half for debate on the bill, with three-quarters of an hour on each side, would be sufficient?

Mr. GEORGE. Just so any Senator who wanted to take 15 or 20 minutes would be recognized for that length of time. I believe an hour or an hour and a half would be ample.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as acting minority leader, in view of what the Senator from Georgia has said, and after discussing the subject with Senators on this side of the aisle, I hope the Senator from Arizona will be willing to make it an hour to each side, or a total of 2 hours of debate on the bill itself. Probably not all the time will be used, but at least we would have that much time available. I would have to object to the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], because deciding what is germane and what is not germane sometimes leads to unpleasantness. I know because I occupied the chair in my home State for 8 years. It would be much better to have a limitation without the necessity of having anyone decide what is or what is not germane.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection to a limitation of 15 minutes, without germaneness, but we have more or less established a pattern with respect to limitations on debate, and the pattern has worked out very well.

Mr. GEORGE. I believe an hour to each side would be ample. I assume I shall be able to be recognized for 15 minutes if I desire to speak.

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope that we will not use all of 2 hours in debate on the bill itself. It is an important bill, as has been suggested by the Senator from Georgia; and because of its importance I have not up to this time suggested that we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement. However, I think the time has arrived when the bill should be passed.

I amend my request to provide for an hour of debate on each side on the bill itself.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request proposed by the Senator from Arizona, as modified?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, I understand that the time allotted to amendments refers also to motions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, to motions and appeals. Of course, that is under the 30-minute limitation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the proposal is for a 30-minute limitation on amendments and for a limitation of 1 hour to each side on the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the unanimous-consent proposal, as modified. Without objection, it is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

*Ordered*, That, beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock noon on the calendar day of Thursday, September 13, 1951, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, proposed to H. R. 5054, the Department of Defense Appropriation Act for 1952, shall be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Mr. O'MAHONEY, respectively; but in the event he is in favor of any such amendment or motion the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by Mr. WHERRY, or someone acting in his behalf; and that debate on the question of the final passage of the bill shall be limited to not exceeding 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. WHERRY, respectively, or someone acting in Mr. WHERRY's behalf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment K of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, without particular regard to this amendment, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am sure he should do exactly what he intends to do, namely, vote in accordance with his convictions and his knowledge. That is what all of us should do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The announcement of the unanimous-consent agreement seems to have been taken by many Members of the Senate as a signal to leave the floor. It had been my hope that we would continue in session until at least 6 p. m. this evening. I was hoping that in the meantime we might dispose of the pending amendment of the Senator from Illinois. So I wish Senators to know that we are likely to have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I should like to complete my statement, and then yield.

Mr. CASE. My question is a very simple one, namely, whether the Senator would consider splitting his amendment. Some of the items of the amendment appeal to me, but one or two of them present some difficulties to me and raise some doubts in my mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be rather complicated if I were to split the amendment. I prefer to submit the amendment as a whole at this time. Perhaps later it can be considered in the way the Senator from South Dakota suggests.

Mr. President, I was about to say that I hope the Senator from Minnesota will do exactly as is his intention, namely, to vote according to his convictions. I am sure no one will question the sincerity of the Senator from Minnesota if he votes against the amendment I have proposed. Certainly no one would have a right to raise such a question; and I assure the Senator that, for myself, I would not question his sincerity. All of us proceed on the assumption that we do that which seems best to us, and we do not question the votes of our colleagues.

I say with all humility that I do not pretend to have complete knowledge regarding this bill or the subjects with which it deals. My knowledge is definitely limited. I try not to take too much time in submitting motions or amendments; and if they are rejected, I shall accept in good faith the decision of the Senate.

So far as concerns what has been stated by the Senator from Minnesota, very likely the Senator from Minnesota would know better than I do about particular questions.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Illinois, let me say that I know that each of us who is privileged to serve the particular State he represents acts in accordance with his best judgment and ability. If it is the judgment of any Member of the Senate that he should submit an amendment calling for either a reduction or an increase in the size of an appropriation item, certainly that is the best judgment of that particular Senator, and I respect it.

As a member of the subcommittee, I can only say that after many, many weeks of hearings we were reluctant to accede to the requests of the Department of Defense in regard to such a huge appropriation bill as this one. However, after all the facts were laid before us, we submitted our report and recommenda-

tion on this matter. Our recommendation on the bill is the best upon which we could agree. In the event we vote against amendments submitted by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, we do so only because we are exercising our best judgment in regard to these questions.

I commend the Senator from Illinois for his efforts to economize. When we are considering a \$61,000,000,000 appropriation bill relating to the Defense Establishment—and the \$61,000,000,000 this bill provides are far from the total amount which will be provided for the Defense Establishment—I say we need examine the items contained in the bill most carefully and we need the best efforts of all Senators in connection with the examination of the bill and to make certain that no one has erred.

That is the reason why I was proposing a watchdog committee, so as to make certain that if someone has erred, such a committee can catch up any errors made along the way in connection with the appropriations for the Military Establishment, because when that Establishment begins to expend \$61,000,000,000, it will have at its disposal such huge sums of money that it will be quite easy for it to be a little liberal at times. Therefore, I hope someone will make certain that the Defense Establishment is not too liberal with the taxpayers' money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment K, submitted by the Senator from Illinois. The Chair understands that the various parts of the amendment are to be considered en bloc.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is precisely for the reason just stated by the Senator from Minnesota that I question the appropriation which is recommended by the committee for this particular item.

#### UNEXPENDED BALANCES FROM FISCAL 1951 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THIS PROGRAM

I should like to remind the Senate that for the fiscal year 1951 we appropriated \$1,100,000,000 for precisely the same purpose, so the Army alone, namely, the purchase of tools and equipment. If my information is correct, out of that amount, judging from the figures on page 7 of the budget document, House Document No. 120, only \$15,000,000 was expended in the fiscal year 1951, leaving unexpended approximately \$1,000,000,000 of the amount appropriated; and it is expected that only approximately \$500,000,000 of that amount will be expended during the fiscal year 1952, for which we are legislating at this time. In other words, there will be a carry-over to the fiscal year 1953 of approximately \$500,000,000.

I think the point made by the Senator from Florida is on sound constitutional grounds, namely, that appropriations for the Armed Forces cannot be made for more than 2 years. Therefore, instead of carrying over to the fiscal year 1953 approximately \$500,000,000, which we appropriated for this item for the

Defense Establishment for the fiscal year 1951, I think that amount must be spent during the fiscal year 1952.

In addition to that amount, the Defense Establishment now requests nearly \$3,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1952. Of course, only a fraction of that amount can be spent during the present fiscal year, an estimated \$300,000,000, according to the budget document. The effect of making so large an appropriation, far in excess of the anticipated rate of expenditure, at this time may circumvent the necessity for an additional authorization of appropriations. Therefore, a reduction of the appropriation for this item seems to me to be thoroughly wise, in view of the fact that there are amounts of \$500,000,000 for this purpose appropriated in fiscal 1951 which will not even be spent in fiscal 1952, plus an additional \$500,000,000 from fiscal 1951 to be spent this year for the Army alone. When these are added to the \$3,000,000,000 requested for fiscal 1952, they make a total of over \$4,000,000,000 now unexpended, but available for this purpose.

Mr. President, after this item was cut \$100,000,000 by the House, I wonder whether the Army appealed from that cut. The Army was told to accept the 10-percent cut, but a similar cut was not imposed upon the Air Force or the Navy. I note that the Senate committee did not see fit to restore the Army's 10-percent cut for this item and that which makes me believe that a 10-percent cut could with profit be imposed upon the appropriations for the Air Force and the Navy.

Therefore, I believe we could do exactly what the Senator from Minnesota has suggested, namely, reduce to some extent the billions of dollars loosely appropriated, which the military will have to play with, and which may tempt them into lavish habits of expenditure without fully exploring other means of financing expansion of productive facilities.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; or I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. I wonder what he means by saying that these sums are loosely appropriated.

I have before me the committee hearings, which constitute one thousand nine hundred-odd pages of printed testimony. I know the committee has been working on this bill since May, and has asked thousands upon thousands of questions. So in my judgment the money is not being loosely appropriated. I think the committee has done an excellent job.

I do not know how the Senator from Illinois arrives at the figures he seemingly pulls out of the air, to include in the amendments he proposes. I do not know how many hearings he conducts or how much expert testimony is given to him.

The Senator from Illinois describes his amendments in broad generalities. He gets great credit from the press, while



those of us who try to follow the recommendations of the committee, which has given such excellent study and attention to the bill, are criticized by the press when we do not go along with the proposals of the Senator from Illinois.

However, my main point is that I wish to contest the statement made by the Senator from Illinois, namely, that these moneys are loosely appropriated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his comment. Perhaps it would be the wiser personal thing for the Senator from Illinois to keep silent when these matters come to the floor of the Senate, and not to propose any reductions in the items.

Mr. HUNT. I would not say that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then the Senator from Illinois would be much more popular with the military and with the civil service, and, no doubt, with his colleagues.

Mr. HUNT. No; but I believe that when the Senator from Illinois submits such an amendment as the one which now is pending he should give to the Senate the testimony upon which he bases the figures at which he arrives in connection with the amendment.

I do not like to be accused by the press of being a spender, when I do not vote for a reduction, which is contrary to the Appropriation Committee's recommendation, and when I feel that the Senator from Illinois has simply picked the figure out of the sky.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming certainly should not be accused in that fashion. The Senator from Illinois will never so accuse him, and I hope no one else will. In brief, what I have said is that, since a 10-percent cut was applied by the House to the Army, I have heard no reason why it should not also be applied to the Air Force and to the Navy. The Army item which was cut was a specific item in the bill. I see no reason for exempting the Navy and the Air Force from the same cut simply because their requests for the same type of expenditures are covered up in other items in the bill. I also pointed out that we have \$500,000,000 of appropriations for the Army for this purpose carrying over from last year, which, according to the estimates in the President's budget document, will not even be spent in fiscal 1952, and which certainly, therefore, should allow us safely to diminish the amounts which we are appropriating for fiscal 1952.

So far as my own study of this matter is concerned, I have gone over the details, here. Without betraying any confidence, I may say that in the Air Force expenditures alone, \$235,000,000 of the appropriations are for undetermined, unspecified projects, with the program not specifically set. I would think, therefore, that it might have been the military which had brought these figures out of the hat, rather than the Senator from Illinois. I submit that this particular reduction is well justified.

Mr. HUNT. The Senator from Illinois is well aware of the fact that testi-

mony has been given to the committee which is not available to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is requested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand from the Senator from Illinois that he is presenting his amendment as a single amendment, or is he dividing it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the Senator from Illinois will be content to present the first item, on lines 1 and 2 of the amendment, because the other amendments cover ships and facilities, ordnance and facilities, aircraft, and related procurement for the Air Force, which constitute four different items in four different parts of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true, but they are for the same purpose. They are not for the direct construction of aircraft and ships, but for the furnishing of tools, implements, and equipment, and for the building of plants. I hope I have made the legislative record clear on that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Following up what the Senator from Wyoming has said, two, and I think three of the Senator's amendments relate to aircraft; the other one relates to ship construction. I observe, frankly, that I should like to vote with the Senator on the ship construction item, but if he includes them all together in one amendment, I shall have to vote against it, because I think the proposal applicable to aircraft should not be agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest that we vote first on the aircraft items and vote, second, on the naval and ordnance items, if that is satisfactory to the Chair and to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator designate on which item he desires the vote to be taken first?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Illinois is withdrawing for the moment the amendments beginning in line 3 and beginning in line 5 of his amendment, so that the vote will now be confined to his proposal to reduce by \$47,000,000 the item for aircraft and related procurement for the Navy, beginning in line 1, and his proposal to reduce by more than \$100,000,000 the appropriation for aircraft and related procurement for the Air Force, beginning in line 7. Do I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say the bill is somewhat complicated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what I am trying to tell the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois was aware that it is a complicated bill. He is an inexperienced traveler through the dark forest, but he is trying to be prepared. The item on page 39, line 10, comes under the appropriation heading "Construction of aircraft and related procurement" under the Navy. I cannot emphasize too strongly that I do not intend that the funds for the procurement of naval aircraft should be reduced by one cent. My amendment is directed at the program described under this heading as "Procurement and installation of equipment in public or private plants," which language may be found on lines 7 and 8 on page 39. The amount budgeted for this, according to figures on page 1265 of the House hearings on the Navy is \$466,442,000, which I am proposing to reduce by 10 percent, to conform with the House cut for the Army.

I am perfectly willing to have that considered by itself, but I ask the Senate to remember that the reduction would be made in funds for expediting construction, not actual procurement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well. It is my understanding now, Mr. President, that the only amendment we are voting on is that presented in lines 1 and 2 of the Senator's amendment, namely, on page 39, line 10, to strike "\$1,050,000,000" and insert "\$1,003,356,000," a reduction of approximately \$47,000,000 for the production of naval aircraft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. A division has been requested.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the next amendment is on page 40, line 3, and deals with ships and facilities; but again I want to remind the Senate that it is not a proposal to reduce direct appropriations for ships and facilities, but merely to decrease the amount of free machinery, equipment and plant facilities furnished to concerns which will construct ships. The portion of the "Ships and facilities" appropriation that I intend to reduce is described in lines 20, 21, and 22 on page 39 of the bill as follows: "procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The purpose of the amendment is not quite clear to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am trying to reduce by 10 percent the amounts allocated for the purchase of machinery, equipment, and facilities which will be turned over to industrial concerns, with which to produce ships, to parallel approximately the 10-percent reduction which has already been proposed by the House with respect to the Army, and which the Senate committee did not restore. If it is asked why this cut should only be \$10,500,000, when the appropriation provided

in the bill is \$1,537,452,000, it is because, as shown on page 1265 of the House Navy hearings, and by the detailed report, the item for this particular program comes to only \$105,000,000, and I am proposing to cut it 10 percent, as the House did in the case of the Army.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand the items referred to are items of machinery with which to produce aircraft.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In this case they are items of machinery and plant facilities to produce ships.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Government will retain title to the machinery and will simply loan it to the manufacturer, will it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. But we know what happened after the last war. Equipment was sold to industrial concerns at a very, very low figure.

Mr. CAPEHART. My question is, No private company would buy that machinery itself, would it, because it would have no need for it, except for war-production purposes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Much of the equipment is not specialized in nature, but it can be used for peacetime production. It is not all unique equipment, useful only for the making of weapons of war. Some of it can be used for peacetime purposes.

Mr. CAPEHART. And the Government will retain title to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The question is, how long it will retain title to it after the war is over.

Mr. CAPEHART. What would happen if there were a refusal to buy machinery in order to build ships? How, then, would the Government secure the building of ships? I do not know whether the machinery is now available. I am proceeding on the assumption that the Navy Department proved that the machinery is not now available, and therefore it has to be created or purchased by the industry, or the Government has to buy it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That, undoubtedly, is the theory upon which the Department of Defense is proceeding, and it should be noted that I am not proposing to eliminate this item, but am leaving 90 percent of it intact. I am not saying this program is entirely based on an incorrect theory; I am saying that it is based on a theory which may lend itself to great abuse. That is something about which we should stop, look, and listen before we embark on this program. A 10-percent cut in the amount, particularly in view of unexpended balances—

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not certain that I do not agree. I think, in principle, it should all be left in or all should be taken out. I am wondering why the purchase of this machinery cannot be handled in some other way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a very serious question, to which I referred last Monday, when I read a list of some of the huge industrial concerns benefiting by this program and by the accelerated tax amortization program. I could not give their names, because they are classi-

fied, and it is proposed to turn over to them hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of equipment. In a great many instances they are also receiving accelerated tax amortizations in the amount of hundreds of millions of dollars. In view of that fact, I believe we should proceed a little carefully in the purchase of equipment, and I said that if this program is socialism my proposal is to have 10 percent less socialism.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would not even compromise on 10 percent, if that were the program. But is it not a fact that if we did not have amortization for tax purposes in connection with the \$9,000,000,000 about which the Senator has been speaking, Congress would have had to appropriate \$9,000,000,000 to produce the facilities?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not going to argue the tax amortization program, because at the moment that is not germane. I do think that in granting tax amortization on plants which had been started or planned before Korea for which the finances—

Mr. CAPEHART. But, proceeding on the theory that amortization for tax purposes has been honestly administered, my question is, Is it not a fact that if we did not have the \$9,000,000,000 under the tax amortization plan, the Congress of the United States would have had to appropriate an additional \$9,000,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I doubt that, myself.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should prefer to address the discussion to the point at issue, which is whether we shall appropriate \$3,000,000,000 for the purchase of machinery and equipment which will then be used by private companies. I certainly do not know enough about it to say we should not purchase any equipment. I can understand the argument that some of the equipment will be so specialized that it will not have a peacetime use, and, therefore, we shall have to help the companies in this way to produce the ships which are needed. Would it not be safer to go a little bit easy and take 10 percent off the Department of the Navy just as we have done in the case of the Army, particularly in view of the fact that there is for the Army nearly a \$1,000,000,000 unexpended balance carried over from appropriations made for fiscal 1951?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the amount of \$61,000,000,000 is entirely too large. I do not think that much is needed. I do not think it could possibly be spent within the next 12 months. I do not know enough about the facts—and I question whether the able Senator from Illinois knows all the facts—to be qualified to say whether the amount should be \$3,000,000,000 or \$2,700,000,000. In my opinion, we are spending too much money. We spend and spend, we appropriate and appropriate. We have one emergency after another, and we give away with never a thought as to what the ultimate result to our country will be. We are spending entirely too much money. But I question whether a 10-

percent reduction in this particular item is proper.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am merely offering a vehicle by which the Senator from Indiana may translate his general indignation about expenditures into specific economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. I stood on the floor of the Senate and voted against the \$7,200,000,000 give-away program a few days ago, and I noticed that the Senator from Illinois voted in favor of it. I vote against those sums that amount to something, whereas the Senator from Illinois indulges in small items which may well be all right. I have voted for 99 percent of them, and I shall continue to vote with the Senator; but when it comes to giving away money to other nations, I notice that the able Senator from Illinois always votes for it. I shall vote to recommend this bill. I think an appropriation of \$50,000,000,000 would be sufficient, and it would be just as nearly accurate as is \$61,000,000,000. I think we should spend in direct proportion to our ability to pay. The idea that we have the money is wrong; we do not have it. The national debt of the United States is \$256,000,000,000. The national debts of all our so-called allies in Europe amount to approximately \$115,000,000,000. Show me wherein we are better off than those nations, when we have a national debt of \$256,000,000,000, and they have a debt of \$115,000,000,000. In less than 2½ months we have run a deficit of four and one-half billion dollars. What are we thinking about? Where do we get this idea?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I welcome the support of the Senator from Indiana on my amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where do we get the idea that we can afford to throw money all around the world, when we have a national debt of \$256,000,000,000?

What are they thinking about? Where are we going and what are we going to look like when we get there if we continue the pace at which we are going? I know it is said that we have had various emergencies.

Mr. President, I wish I had before me the last report issued on the Marshall plan. I do not know how many times in that report the statement is made that the Marshall plan is being operated for the purpose of stopping communism. It is said that that is the purpose of the plan, and that the Marshall plan has resulted in stopping communism. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the Marshall plan was first suggested it was never the intention by that plan to stop communism. There was never a word mentioned about that. In fact, the Marshall plan when it was initiated was intended to take in all European countries, including Russia, and a Russian delegation attended the first Marshall plan conference in Paris, as did delegations from some of her satellites. The first report that was issued on the Marshall plan by Mr. Hoffman in 1949 did not say a word about stopping communism.



Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I ask if there is an amendment before the Senate?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have the floor. I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have the floor. The Senator from Illinois took his seat.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the Senator from Illinois has the floor, and yielded to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, that could not possibly be true, because the able Senator from Illinois surrendered the floor and took his seat, and remained seated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the RECORD will show, Mr. President, that I yielded to the Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois yielded to the Senator from Indiana a few moments ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yielded to the Senator from Indiana, but not for an unlimited period. I would prefer to have the Senator speak on this matter, which seems to be extraneous to the amendment before the Senate, at some time other than in the midst of my own remarks.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Senator from Illinois does not like to hear such a speech as I am making. I know he does not like to hear it. But I want to say again that the purpose of the Marshall plan was never to stop communism. Russia was invited to participate in the Marshall plan. The delegates from Russia attended the first meeting on the Marshall plan held in Paris. In the first report issued by Mr. Hoffman there was not one word said about stopping communism.

Mr. President, the administration for years and years has lived on one emergency after another.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment before the Senate now is an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to strike about \$11,000,000 from the appropriation in this bill for ships and facilities. It deals only with a single item in that appropriation. This appropriation is designed to support the maintenance and operation of the active fleet, and to bring some of the reserve fleet into existence. This appropriation includes the development of electronics. It includes cataloging and standardization. It includes research development. It includes maintenance and operation of shore facilities and of naval reserve vessels, industrial mobilization, fuel for ships, and departmental administration.

The subject to which the Senator has been directing his attention is that of industrial mobilization which is carried in the budget at \$29,000,000. The Senator's amendment would strike \$11,000,000 from that item, which is used for the purchase of machine tools. It would im-

pair the operation which is now going on for keeping in trim the naval vessels which are now plying back and forth across the Atlantic Ocean. It does not deal with the Marshall plan or with any of the international affairs. This is an appropriation for the support of the American Navy, and I feel that the amendment which the Senator from Illinois has offered makes an altogether improper cut in the appropriation.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be rejected. I may say after the vote upon this amendment is had, I shall suggest to the majority leader that the Senate recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon, when we may resume the consideration of these amendments. I did this politely to suggest to the Senator from Indiana that the discussion of these other aspects of the bill, of the policy which the Government is following, might well be postponed until that time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I fully understand that the Marshall plan has nothing to do with this appropriation. But I want to say that we have a record here of spending and spending and spending. We have a record of appropriating and appropriating and appropriating. We have a record of having one emergency after the other. We have a record of going into the Marshall plan originally to rehabilitate the war-torn countries of Europe, and then when we get that job accomplished, we have an emergency and start on an entirely different line of selling the American people on the idea that we must put \$25,000,000,000 more over there for another purpose.

The only reason I rose was to ask a question. My question is: When are we going to come to our senses in this country and in this Congress? When are we going to realize that there is a limit to what the United States can do? When are we going to realize that we ourselves have a \$256,000,000,000 debt? When are we going to realize that the countries upon whom we are showering money have less than half as much debt as we have?

Oh yes, we hear the argument that our national income is much greater than theirs, and that our per capita wealth is much greater than theirs. I say to the Senate that that is a socialistic argument, in itself it is a communistic argument. When it is said that we have more than the other fellow, and therefore we have to divide up with him, that is a socialistic premise, a socialistic philosophy, which is used over and over and over again on the floor of the Senate in arguments in favor of doing this, that, and the other thing.

Mr. President, we kick the brains out of private industry in America which is supporting this program, and yet we appropriate and have appropriated billions upon billions of dollars to support a socialistic government in England.

We appropriate money to support a government in France, a government which is more than 50 percent composed

of Socialists and Communists. We keep a socialistic government in power in England knowing full well that if socialism becomes stronger in England, knowing full well that if nationalization of all industry is adopted in England, some day we will be forced to do the same thing in the United States.

We recognized Russia in 1933, well knowing that if we helped to make communism a success in Russia, and it became successful, some day it would cause us trouble, and cause the whole world trouble. Yet, after three Presidents of the United States had refused to recognize Communist Russia, President Roosevelt recognized Communist Russia in 1933, and sent great teams of our experts over there to show the Russians how to develop mass production and build everything.

We are continuing along the same line here today. We are continuing to waste money, to squander money, to give money away, knowing that we have a \$256,000,000,000 debt, knowing that we are almost confiscating by taxation the income of our people in the United States. Yet, we go on and on without any end; we have war after war; we have emergency after emergency.

I feel very much discouraged. I say to Senators that they had better listen. If they are dissatisfied with what is going on in the United States, they had better take a good look at themselves in the mirror. The President of the United States has no power or authority which the Congress of the United States has not given to him. Senators may write letters back home as much as they please, and make as many speeches as they please, and blame the President for heavy taxation and large appropriations and unbalanced budgets; but it is the Congress of the United States which enacts the laws which gives him the authority. It is the Congress of the United States which appropriates the money which he is spending. It is the Congress of the United States which levies taxes. It is not the President of the United States. Some Senators think we are on our way to a dictatorship in the United States some of these days; I agree with them. But when they go home tonight, let them take a good look at themselves in the mirror, because they are a part of the Congress of the United States which is giving the President of the United States the power and the authority to do all these things. Senators had better take a good look at themselves in the mirror and find out what is going on, because if this country goes bankrupt, as many people say it will, we cannot blame the President of the United States, because the Congress has control of the purse strings in America. We can put a stop to it any time we want to. We can cut this appropriation as much as we want to cut it.

I am not unmindful of the fact that communism is spreading throughout the world. It has spread throughout the world. We have not stopped it. There is more communism today than ever,

and more people are under its domination today than there were 5 years ago.

We cannot buy good will with money. We seem to have the idea in Congress that we can solve all our own problems and all the problems of the world merely by appropriating more money. We seem to think that we can buy our way through the world with the dollar. I say that we cannot do it. If we could have bought good will with dollars, Russia ought to love us to death, and we ought to have the good will of Russia, because, God knows, we gave the Russians many billions of dollars in money and materials during World War II. We were their friends and supporters. We appropriated money which went directly to them. We bought materials and gave them to the Russians. Did it buy us any good will? It certainly did not.

Now we have another emergency. During World War II we had to stop Hitler. We had to stop nazism, so we teamed up with another cutthroat by the name of Stalin. We thought we could buy his good will with dollars, and we tried it. We were unable to do it. We gave India \$300,000,000 not long ago. We said we would buy India's good will, but we did not buy it. We do not have India's good will. India wants us to recognize the Chinese Communists. She refused to sign the Japanese Peace Treaty. We did not buy her good will. We cannot buy good will with money. We have been trying to do it for years, and it will not work.

Before I take my seat, let me repeat that we had better go home tonight and take a good look at ourselves in the mirror if we want to find out what is going on in the United States, and find out who is responsible for it. I repeat that the President of the United States has no power except that which is given to him by the Congress. He does not have a dollar to spend except that which is appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is making a fine speech, but he is wasting his breath. He is not changing any votes. The press will not report what he is saying, and he might as well take his seat.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is perfectly correct when he speaks of limitations on the authority of the President. I wonder if the Senator has read the history of the Revolutionary War.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not get the Senator's point.

Mr. KILGORE. I am asking whether or not the Senator from Indiana has studied the history of the Revolutionary War. During that period there was no executive authority, and the Congress endeavored to handle the financial aspects of the war without an executive department.

Mr. CAPEHART. I still do not get the point.

Mr. KILGORE. I am merely asking whether or not the Senator from Indiana has read the history of the Revolutionary War, which is published in any number of books.

Mr. CAPEHART. What has that to do with the appropriations before us today?

Mr. KILGORE. If the Congress usurps the power of the Executive, we shall place ourselves back in the situation we were in during the time of the Revolutionary War. I ask the Senator whether he has studied the history of the Revolutionary War, when the Congress endeavored to carry out the Executive authority.

Mr. CAPEHART. What I said was just the opposite. I said that the President of the United States has no authority except that which is given to him by the Congress.

Mr. KILGORE. I agree with the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. He has not a single dollar to spend except that which is appropriated by the Congress. My point is that it is our responsibility. We can put a stop to much of the monkey-business which is going on, and the waste, which I think will eventually bring bankruptcy to this Nation. We have a responsibility, and we ought to accept it.

The able junior Senator from Indiana has said that I am making no progress and changing no votes. I am inclined to agree with him, but I am making a record, so that when our children, our grandchildren, and our great-grandchildren read it, they will at least recognize the fact that there was one person who felt that the Congress of the United States ought to accept the responsibility for what is happening today.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator from Indiana if he wants the Congress to usurp the duties of the executive department.

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot see anything in what I have said that has anything to do with taking power away from the President. What I said was that the President gets his authority through legislation enacted by the Congress. He gets the money to spend through appropriations made by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], which are being considered en bloc as amendment designated "K."

The amendment was rejected.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Gus F. Geissler, of North Dakota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice Ralph S. Trigg, resigned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Thomas B. Reed, and sundry other employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for permanent appointment, as commissioned captain, lieutenant (junior grade), and ensigns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jess Larson to be Defense Materials Procurement Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 13, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 12 (legislative day of September 4), 1951:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Nepal, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

##### SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Robert A. Lovett, of New York, to be Secretary of Defense.

##### DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

William C. Foster, of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

##### IN THE NAVY

The following named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve on active duty for temporary appointment to the grade of captain, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

For temporary appointment in the Navy:	
Edward W. Abbot	Harold R. Badger
Noah Adair, Jr.	Christopher S. Barker
Harry A. Adams, Jr.	Stanley M. Barnes
Lionel A. Arthur	Arthur J. Barrett, Jr.
Frederick L. Ashworth	Porter F. Bedell
Hugh R. Awtrey	Lorentz D. Belling



Carter L. Bennett  
 Samuel Bertolet  
 James S. Bethae  
 James V. Bewick  
 Horace V. Bird  
 John T. Blackburn  
 Arthur M. Blamphin  
 Francis J. Blouin  
 Harold G. Bowen, Jr.  
 Merle F. Bowman  
 Theodore H. Brittan  
 Frederick W. Bruning  
 Paul D. Buile  
 John D. Bulkeley  
 Carl E. Bull  
 Jesse B. Burks  
 James B. Burrow  
 Robert S. Camera  
 Clifford M. Campbell  
 Earnest G. Campbell  
 James H. Campbell  
 William J. Catlett, Jr.  
 Jay V. Chase  
 Benjamin B. Cheatham  
 Joseph O. Christian  
 Warren B. Christie  
 Thomas A. Christopher  
 Herbert G. Claudius  
 Merrill K. Clementson  
 James O. Cobb  
 Garrett S. Coleman  
 Elmer H. Conklin  
 Thomas F. Connolly  
 Lester C. Conwell  
 Joseph P. Costello  
 John L. Counihan, Jr.  
 Gilbert L. Countryman  
 John S. Coye, Jr.  
 Harold F. Crist  
 Harold E. Cross  
 Robert W. Curtis  
 Charles A. Curtze  
 Roy M. Davenport  
 Ray Davis  
 Thomas M. Davis  
 William L. Dawson  
 James B. Denny  
 Richard B. Derickson, Jr.  
 Irvin L. Dew  
 Frank A. Dingfelder  
 Bennett M. Dodson  
 Charles K. Duncan  
 James M. Elliott  
 Joseph F. Enright  
 Glover T. Ferguson  
 James D. Ferguson  
 James H. Fortune, Jr.  
 William C. Fortune  
 Everett J. Foster  
 James G. Franklin  
 Edward H. Fredericks  
 Charles T. Fritter  
 Raymond L. Fulton  
 Raymond D. Fusselman  
 Ignatius J. Galantin  
 Antone R. Gallaher  
 Norman W. Gambling  
 Philip W. Garnett  
 Robert E. Garrels  
 Charles F. Garrison  
 Richard C. Gazlay  
 Robert M. Gibbons  
 James B. Grady  
 George D. Gregor  
 Edward E. Grimm  
 Murray Hanson  
 Ward F. Hardman  
 Irvin S. Hartman  
 Enrique D. Haskins  
 Julian S. Hatcher, Jr.  
 Luther C. Heinz  
 Blissh C. Hills  
 William S. Howell  
 George K. Hudson  
 Elgin B. Hurlbert  
 Francis O. Iffrig

Albert C. Ingels  
 Walter D. Innis  
 Charles B. Jackson, Jr.  
 Edward F. Jackson  
 Raymond B. Jacoby  
 Elliott L. James, Jr.  
 Carlton B. Jones  
 Jamie E. Jones  
 John H. S. Johnson  
 Stephen Jurika, Jr.  
 William R. Kane  
 John H. Kaufman  
 Robert A. Keating, Jr.  
 Clarence A. Keller, Jr.  
 Richard L. Kibbe  
 Nova B. Kiergan, Jr.  
 Charles E. King  
 George P. Koch  
 Joseph W. Koenig  
 Alexander Kusebauch  
 George H. Laird, Jr.  
 David Lambert  
 Richard Lane  
 Thomas D. Langen  
 Theodore S. Lank  
 Charles O. Larson  
 Willard R. Laughon  
 Robert W. Leach  
 John S. Lehman  
 Philip P. Leigh  
 Hayden L. Leon  
 Porter Lewis  
 Elmer C. Long  
 Charles E. Loughlin  
 Kenneth Loveland  
 Benjamin L. Lubelsky  
 Michael J. Luosey  
 William W. R. MacDonald  
 Donald E. MacIntosh  
 Robert A. Macpherson  
 Robert B. Madden  
 Robert E. Magoffin  
 John L. Maloney  
 Stevan Mandarich  
 Joseph I. Manning  
 Martin W. Mason  
 David L. Martineau  
 Paul Masterton  
 Dale Mayberry  
 Harry C. Maynard  
 Bernard H. Meyer  
 Clayton L. Miller  
 Edwin S. Miller  
 George H. Miller  
 Richard L. Mohan  
 George G. Molumphy  
 Henry S. Monroe  
 Charles L. Moore, Jr.  
 Thomas H. Moorer  
 Thomas H. Morton  
 Jesse H. Motes, Jr.  
 William C. Mott  
 David McCampbell  
 Henry H. McCarley  
 David H. McDonald  
 Hugh R. McKibbin  
 Dillon R. McMullen  
 Walter H. Newton, Jr.  
 Easton B. Noble  
 James R. Ogden  
 Robert I. Olsen  
 Samuel H. Pattie  
 Albert G. Pelling  
 Charles E. Perkins  
 Adolph J. Petersen  
 George L. Phillips  
 George E. Pierce  
 William V. Pratt II  
 Ralph M. Pray  
 George M. Price  
 William M. Rakow  
 James R. Reedy  
 Robert S. Riddell  
 William C. F. Robards  
 Charles E. Robertson  
 Jack W. Roe  
 George P. Rogers  
 George D. Rouillard  
 Harold E. Ruble  
 Henry P. Rumble

Baxter L. Russell  
 William M. Ryon  
 Selby K. Santmyers  
 Arnold F. Schade  
 Frank D. Schwartz  
 Isador J. Schwartz  
 Frank G. Selby  
 Leland G. Shaffer  
 John Shannon  
 Edward E. Shelby  
 Martin A. Shellabarger  
 William R. Sheeley  
 Albert L. Shepherd  
 Wallace A. Sherrill  
 Ralph L. Shifley  
 Kenneth S. Shook  
 Frank M. Slater  
 Morgan Slayton  
 James A. Smith  
 John B. Smith  
 Norman E. Smith  
 Lewis L. Snider  
 Otto W. Spahr, Jr.  
 Robert H. Soller  
 David A. Sooy  
 Paul L. Stahl  
 Reuben E. Stanley  
 Poyntell C. Staley, Jr.  
 John M. Steinbeck  
 Lemuel M. Stevens  
 Bernard M. Strean  
 John M. Stuart  
 Henry D. Sturr

For temporary appointment in the Naval Reserve:

Allie R. Bosworth  
 Rosewell P. Bowles  
 Frank P. Brown  
 Irven H. Cammarn  
 Denzel R. Carr  
 Stanley W. Carr  
 Chester J. Chastek  
 Arthur Enderlin  
 William P. Fetzer  
 Roy T. Gallemore  
 Harry C. Howe  
 Jack M. Howell  
 Joseph B. Hoyt, Jr.  
 William C. Hughes  
 Stephen E. Jones

Ralph E. Styles  
 William H. Sublette  
 Morton Sunderland  
 Rufus L. Taylor  
 Donald I. Thomas  
 Hubert E. Thomas  
 Edgar K. Thompson  
 Raymond W. Thompson, Jr.  
 Carl Tiedeman  
 Jack C. Titus  
 James F. Tucker  
 John A. Tyree, Jr.  
 George P. Unmacht  
 James J. Vaughan  
 Ruben E. Wagstaff  
 Thomas G. Wallace  
 Waldemar F. A. Wendt  
 Justin L. Wickens  
 Bruce E. Wiggin  
 Frederick H. Wahlig  
 James W. White  
 Chauncey S. Willard  
 Joseph W. Williams, Jr.  
 Francis E. Wilson  
 William R. Wilson  
 Philip W. Winston  
 William Winter, Jr.  
 Archie T. Wright, Jr.  
 Theodore R. Voageley  
 Raymond P. Zimmerman

George F. Kennedy  
 Joseph H. Kimpler  
 Glenn B. Lantz  
 David E. L. Lithgow  
 William N. Montgomery  
 Henry C. Nichols  
 Norris W. Potter, Jr.  
 Carl D. Short  
 William J. Strachan  
 William N. Van Denburgh  
 Quentell Violet  
 Marcus L. Whitford

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 12 (legislative day of September 4), 1951:

#### DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT ADMINISTRATION

Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be Defense Materials Procurement Administrator.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1951

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 151, Eighty-second Congress, the House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God from whose abiding presence neither time nor distance can separate us, in this moment of communion we would erect our Ebenezer of thanksgiving for hitherto Thou hast blessed us and through Thy mercies we have been spared and by Thy power we have daily been sustained.

Grant that now, with renewed energy and enthusiasm of faith and courage

and inspired with prophetic vision and unity of purpose, we may again address ourselves to the high and noble task of seeking to find a just and righteous solution to the many difficult social, political, and economic problems which confront our day and generation.

We pray that our President, our Speaker, the Members of Congress, and all who hold positions of leadership, influence, and authority in our Republic may know how to use wisely every resource and art of persuasive reasoning in proclaiming and establishing the ideals and principles of a God-fearing democracy.

May our testimony to the worth and grandeur of the democratic way of life be so clear and commanding that men and nations hearing the Voice of America may feel that this is the voice of freedom and may their hearts be kindled with new hope for the coming of that glorious day of universal peace and brotherhood.

We thank Thee for the life and character of Thy servants whom Thou hast called unto Thyself and who are now dwelling with Thee in heavenly blessedness. Grant unto the members of their bereaved families the consolation of Thy grace.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 23, 1951, was read and approved.

#### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On August 20, 1951:

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of Maj. Bruce B. Calkins.

On August 21, 1951:

H. R. 3795. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3911. An act to provide appropriate lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who lost or lose their lives in the armed services of the United States during World War II or during any subsequent war or period of armed hostilities in which the United States may be engaged.

On August 22, 1951:

H. R. 2736. An act to authorize advances for clothing and equipment to cadets at the Military Academy and the Coast Guard Academy and to midshipmen at the Naval Academy, and for other purposes.

On August 24, 1951:

H. R. 4601. An act to provide that the admissions tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

On August 28, 1951:

H. R. 4106. An act to amend section 1732 of title 28, United States Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" by adding a